UNIVERSITY
OF FLORIDA
LIBRARIES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
University of Florida, George A. Smathers Libraries

https://archive.org/details/minutesofmanches201manc

Chetham Society:

ESTABLISHED M.DCCC.XLIII., FOR THE PUBLICATION OF HISTORICAL AND LITERARY REMAINS CONNECTED WITH THE PALATINE COUNTIES OF

Lancaster and Chester.

COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1888-9.

President.

The Worshipful RICHARD COPLEY CHRISTIE, M.A., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester.

Vice-President.

The Right Rev. THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, D.D.

Council.

JAMES CROSTON, Esq., F.S.A.
J. P. EARWAKER, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.
LIEUT.-COLONEL FISHWICK, F.S.A.
HENRY H. HOWORTH, Esq., M.P., F.S.A.
The Rev. JOHN HOWARD MARSDEN, B.D., F.R.G.S., late Disney Professor.
The Rev. JAMES RAINE, M.A., Canon of York, Fellow of Durham University.
FRANK RENAUD, Esq., M.D., F.S.A.
J. P. RYLANDS, Esq., F.S.A.
A. W. WARD, Esq., Lit.D., M.A.

Treasurer.

J. JOSEPH JORDAN, Esq., the Bank, St. Ann's Street, Manchester.

Honorary Secretary.

The Rev. RICHARD TONGE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester.

RULES.

1. That the Society shall be limited to three hundred and fifty members.

2. That the Society shall consist of members being subscribers of one pound annually, such subscription to be paid in advance, on or before the day of general meeting in each year. The first general meeting to be held on the 23rd day of March, 1843, and the general meeting in each year afterwards on the first day of March, unless it fall on a Sunday, when some other day is to be named by the Council.

3. That the affairs of the Society be conducted by a Council, consisting of a permanent President and Vice-President, and twelve other members, including a Treasurer and Secretary, all of whom shall be elected, the first two at the general meeting next after a vacancy shall occur, and the twelve other members at the general meeting annually.

4. That the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Society be audited annually, by three auditors, to be elected at the general meeting; and that any member who shall be one year in arrear of his subscription, shall no longer be considered as belonging to the Society.

5. That every member not in arrear of his annual subscription, be entitled to a copy of each of the works published by the Society.

6. That twenty copies of each work shall be allowed to the editor of the same, in addition to the one to which he may be entitled as a member.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

942.7836
C52Lan
no.5
1920

NEW SERIES.

FIRST YEAR (1882–3).

Vol. 1. The Vicars of Rochdale. By the late Rev. Canon Raines, M.A., F.S.A. Edited by HENRY H. HOWORTH, F.S.A. Part 1. *pp.* xiii. 200.

Vol. 2. The Vicars of Rochdale. Part 2. *pp.* 201–391.

Vol. 3. Lancashire and Cheshire Wills and Inventories at Chester, with an Appendix of Abstracts of Wills now Lost or Destroyed. Transcribed by the late Rev. G. J. PICCOPE, M.A. Edited by J. P. EARWAKER, M.A., F.S.A. *pp.* x. 262.

SECOND YEAR (1883–4).

Vol. 4. The *Catechisme, or a Christian Doctrine necessary for Children and Ignorant people*, of Lawrence Vaux, 1574, sometime Warden of the Collegiate Church, Manchester. Edited by T. G. LAW, Esq., Signet Library, Edinburgh. *pp.* cx. 111.

Vol. 5. The Rectors of Manchester, and the Wardens of the Collegiate Church of that Town. By the late Rev. F. R. RAINES, M.A. Edited by J. E. BAILEY, F.S.A. Part I. The Rectors; Warden Huntingdon to Warden Chaderton. *pp.* xx. 100.

Vol. 6. The Rectors of Manchester, and the Wardens of the Collegiate Church of that Town. Part II. Warden Dee to Warden Herbert. *pp.* 101–206.

THIRD YEAR (1884–5).

Vol. 7. The Old Church and School Libraries of Lancashire. With Bibliographical and other Illustrations. By RICHARD COPLEY CHRISTIE. *pp.* xiii. 215.

Vol. 8. The History of the Parish of Poulton-le-Fylde. By HENRY FISHWICK, F.S.A. *pp.* 232.

Vol. 9. The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey. Part I. The Furness Domains. Edited by the Rev. J. C. ATKINSON, M.A. *pp.* 260.

FOURTH YEAR (1885–6).

Vol. 10. The History of the Parish of Bispham. By HENRY FISHWICK, F.S.A. *pp.* 143.

Vol. 11. The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey. Part II. Edited by the Rev. J. C. ATKINSON, M.A. *pp.* 261–536.

Vol. 12. The Crosby Records. Edited by the Rev. T. E. GIBSON and the late Bishop GOSS. *pp.* xxvi. 108.

FIFTH YEAR (1886–7).

Vol. 13. A Bibliography of the Works Written and Edited by Dr. Worthington. By R. C. CHRISTIE. *pp.* vii. 88.

Vol. 14. The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey. Part III. Edited by the Rev. J. C. ATKINSON, D.C.L. *pp.* lx. 537–728.

Vol. 15. The History of the Church and Manor of Wigan. Part I. By the Hon. and Rev. CANON BRIDGEMAN. *pp.* vii. 180.

SIXTH YEAR (1887–8).

Vol. 16. The History of the Church and Manor of Wigan. Part II. By the Hon. and Rev. CANON BRIDGEMAN. *pp.* 181–460.

Vol. 17. The History of the Church and Manor of Wigan. Part III. By the Hon. and Rev. CANON BRIDGEMAN. *pp.* 461–684.

Vol. 18. The History of the Church and Manor of Wigan. Part IV. By the Hon. and Rev. CANON BRIDGEMAN. *pp.* 685-836. *(Conclusion.)*

SEVENTH YEAR (1888–9).

Vol. 19. Correspondence of Edward, Third Earl of Derby, during the years 24 to 31 Henry VIII. Edited by T. NORTHCOTE TOLLER, M.A. *pp.* xxvi. 138.

Vol. 20. The Minutes of the Manchester Presbyterian Classis. Part I. Edited by WM. A. SHAW, M.A. *pp.* cxli. 82.

REMAINS

Historical and Literary

CONNECTED WITH THE PALATINE COUNTIES OF

Lancaster and Chester.

VOLUME 20.—NEW SERIES.

MANCHESTER:
Printed for the Chetham Society.
1890.

VOR.	Ashton		
FIL.	P		
DEF	Ref		
CLASS	942.7		8
CAT.			
BOOK NO.	K455		12/00

B427

The Chetham Society.

COUNCIL FOR 1888–9.

THE WORSHIPFUL RICHARD COPLEY CHRISTIE, M.A.,
CHANCELLOR OF THE DIOCESE OF MANCHESTER, PRESIDENT.

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, D.D.,
VICE-PRESIDENT.

JAMES CROSTON, ESQ., F.S.A.

J. P. EARWAKER, ESQ., M.A., F.S.A.

LIEUT.-COLONEL FISHWICK, F.S.A.

HENRY H. HOWORTH, ESQ., M.P., F.S.A.

REV. JOHN HOWARD MARSDEN, B.D., F.R.G.S.,
LATE DISNEY PROFESSOR.

REV. JAMES RAINE, M.A., CANON OF YORK.

FRANK RENAUD, ESQ., M.D., F.S.A.

J. P. RYLANDS, ESQ., F.S.A.

A. W. WARD, ESQ., LIT.D., M.A.

J. JOSEPH JORDAN, ESQ., TREASURER.

REV. RICHARD TONGE, M.A., HON. CANON OF MANCHESTER,
HON. SECRETARY.

MINUTES

OF THE

Manchester Presbyterian Classis.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM A. SHAW, M.A.,

Berkeley Fellow of Owens College.

PART I.

PRINTED FOR THE CHETHAM SOCIETY.

1890.

Printed by Charles E. Simms,
Manchester.

PREFACE.

THE following pages contain probably the most perfect of the surviving records of Presbyterianism under the Commonwealth. Their interest is extreme, alike for local and general history. Local allusions occur in abundance, and the store of biographical matter is a large one, especially in the accounts of ministerial ordinations. But the interest of these minutes to the general student of English Church history is deeper. Lancashire was the home of the Presbyterian system in its strongest and purest form. The Manchester classis was the first in importance, and apparently in activity, of all the Lancashire Presbyteries. Its minutes illustrate alike the reality and the unreality of the system as established in this country during a few years—its actual and vigorous exercise of a censorial jurisdiction for a time, the methods of that jurisdiction, and the extent to which it was accepted and obeyed by the lay community. The records are complete up to the Restoration, and form by

their completeness a most significant adjunct to, and commentary on, the civil history of the period. Still their chief interest centres in the queston of jurisdiction, and of the practice of the Presbyterian system of Church government in a community unfitted for it alike by its previous history and its national temperament.

The editing of these minutes was undertaken by the late Mr. J. E. Bailey many years since. But at his death nothing was found among his papers in the shape of annotation, or of any actual preparation of these minutes for the press. There were, however, numerous notes concerning Lancashire Presbyterianism, and Lancashire and Cheshire ministers and laymen generally, showing how thoroughly and exhaustively he intended to treat the subject. These notes have been of great use in the preparation of the biographical notices of ministers appended to the third volume, and of many of the notes on laymen appended to the text. In every case where Mr. Bailey is the sole source of information, the passage will be found marked by his initials. Otherwise the whole of the work has been done *de novo*, an independent transcript, collation, annotation, and introduction. The introduction forms part of a larger study undertaken in accordance with the regulations of the Bishop Berkeley fellowships at the Owens College, my tenure of one of which was extended by the kindness

of the donor, with a view to the completion of my studies in this subject.

The introduction is a contribution to the general rather than the local history of the subject. As a matter of history my interest, and that of many students, is more with the general principles of the religious movement of the time than with the particulars of any one of its local organisations. But a knowledge of these local assemblies is essential to an understanding of the religious history of the Commonwealth in its entirety. Hitherto the subject has not been approached from this standpoint. I venture to assert that it is the only one that will yield any positive practical results. In this particular instance the introduction is confined entirely to the question of the general preparation of the country at large for the admission of the Presbyterian system, and that by means of the ecclesiastical debates of the year 1641, and of the negotiations for the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant. I have necessarily traversed ground that has already been gone over by Mr. GARDINER, but as my standpoint is slightly different it may not be considered presumptuous to say that my work has been entirely independent. Every student of this period of English History owes to that great historian a growing debt; the further he goes the more conscious he becomes of it; but equally true is it that every student of this or of any other period of

History must approach his particular subject, in which he is interested, from his own standpoint, and create his own knowledge. Otherwise he is no student.

It may seem strange to some that the introduction stops at this point, thus leaving untouched what might strike the general reader as more essential features of the question, viz., the successive measures adopted by the Assembly of Divines and the Parliament for the introduction and working of a Presbyterian system of church government and worship, and the particular history of the subject in Lancashire, or in any other stated district. This is due to a consciousness that the time for this extended investigation is not yet come. We do not know in what counties of England the system was actually established —the traditional view is grossly incorrect—and with regard to any particular county, our own for instance, much still remains to be done in the way of preparation. Before the history of Lancashire Commonwealth Presbyterianism can be properly written, the records of the remaining classes should be forthcoming; a fresh edition of Calamy and Walker should be at hand; there are ecclesiastical visitations, and minutes of various parliamentary committees — for scandalous ministers, for plundered ministers, etc. — to be made generally accessible. All this is in store, and there is hope that it may see light. But for the present in these volumes I have

simply broken ground in this really new region of investigation.

With regard to editorial method—the punctuation throughout is arbitrary, following the sense and not the *MS.* wherever the two do not agree. The spelling of the original has been exactly preserved, but clerical abbreviations have not been followed : thus, ꝑ is invariably in these volumes printed *in extenso—per*, *pre*, *pro*, etc.,—as the case may be, and so for other abbreviations. Where the interest of the document is purely historical, there is no meaning in the retention of these forms. The question of spelling is quite different, as that has a phonological as well as a philological significance. Another departure from the *MS.* is in the point of dates falling under the overlapping period January 1—March 24. In *all* such cases the year is printed according to the double method. Thus 18 Feb. 1659 of the *MS.* appears in the text as 18 Feb. $16\frac{59}{60}$. Between the Old and the New Styles there is a further difference of actual date, February 18 of the 17th century being equivalent to February 28 of the 19th. This might be represented thus, February $\frac{18}{28}$, but for simplicity this method has not been adopted. The date of the month throughout is according to the Old Style, exactly as in the *MS.*

In conclusion I have to express most sincere thanks to many kind helpers. In the first place to Mr. Chancellor

Christie, the president of the Chetham Society, for kindest assistance and encouragement. Mr. Christie has purchased and presented to the Chetham Library most of Mr. Bailey's *MSS.* relating to Lancashire and Cheshire, and so conferred a general boon on students as well as a particular one on myself. I have also received invaluable aid and invariable courtesy from Mr. C. W. Sutton, the chief librarian of Manchester, and must further express my best thanks for assistance to Messrs. J. P. Earwaker, Ernest Axon, H. A. Wilson, the librarian of Magdalen College, Oxford, Rich. Welford, Maberley Phillips, C. Goodyear, librarian of the Lancashire Independent College, J. T. Godfrey, Giles Shaw, and to the Rev. Canon Eagar, M.A., Rector of Ashton-under-Lyne, and many clergymen throughout the country who have kindly sent me extracts from their registers.

The Latin of several of the ordination theses was corrupt. For help in the restoration of the original in these cases, and correction in all, I am indebted to Dr. A. S. Wilkins, of the Owens College. I must also acknowledge the help I have received from Mr. J. P. Earwaker's edition of the *Manchester Court Leet Records.* It is the subject for sincerest congratulation that the Corporation of Manchester has had those valuable records printed, and that the work has been executed in so scholarly

a manner. In the present instance these *Court Leet Records* have been used for details as to persons merely, and they have answered that purpose as no other source could have done; but the significance of manorial records is wider and deeper than this. They are of value to the student of legal antiquities and of prices and economic progress, and it would be well if other possessors of such documents would consent to their publication.

Finally, on behalf of the Chetham Society, I tender their thanks to the Rev. S. A. Steinthal, and the trustees of the Cross Street Chapel, for allowing opportunity for a complete collation of my transcript with the original in their possession. For this purpose it was deposited at the Owens College during my convenience. It may be of interest to add a note as to the contents of the volume containing these minutes.[1]

[1] The *MS.* is a large folio volume containing 339 pages, distributed as follows:—

1–178 The Manchester minutes.
193–201 Minutes of the united Brethren.
221–224 A register of deaths from Feb. 6, 1772–Aug. 17, 1776.
243–252 Register of baptisms by the Rev. Robert Gore.
255–310 A copy of baptisms by the Rev. Joseph Mottershead, and of persons admitted by him to the Sacrament at the chapel.

The classis minutes were probably written down at a period subsequent to the meetings, being taken from files of loose papers, ministers' ordination notices, etc., etc. Only one of the signatures in the volume has the appearance of being an autograph. It is probable

that the files of papers survived until at least the end of the seventeenth century, as there are traces of a recension in a handwriting that must belong to that or a later date, and which must have been based upon the possession either of an earlier *MS.* volume, or more likely of the original files. Significantly, too, the classis during its controversy with the Royalist gentlemen of the neighbourhood published matter that purported to be drawn from the records of the classis, but which is not now to be found there (see notes under date September, 1655, and May, 1658), a fact which points to the loss or suppression of some of the papers before their final arrangement in a book form.

Wherever any addition or recension in the later handwriting is of importance, it will be found marked in the text by a hand, thus, ☞.

There is a tradition that the meetings of the classis were held in the Great Hall of the College at Hunt's Bank.

Wm. A. SHAW.

Stanley Mount,
Taunton Road,
Ashton-under-Lyne.
June 1, 1890.

INTRODUCTION.

ENGLISH CIVIL-WAR PRESBYTERIANISM.

IN the course of history every epoch or event has a twofold character. Under one aspect it is merely a link in a long chain of causation, binding past and future; under the other it presents the appearance of an isolated phenomenon, with clearly marked limits of its own and a distinct character. The difficulty of appreciating and expressing by some name this composite nature is quite a general one, but it is specially present to the mind of the student of the great civil strife which convulsed England in the middle of the 17th century. The civil wars under Charles were the result of causes that had been at work for more than two generations. Since the consolidation of the nation under Elizabeth—since 1588—a twofold growth had been silently going on—of Constitutionalism in the civil life, of Puritanism in the religious life of the nation; and the wars became a necessity when this twofold progress could no longer be contained and controlled by the old forms, by the old civil and religious institutions. And yet an attentive consideration of these civil wars will reveal their phenomenal nature. The years 1640–5

were the most revolutionary that this country has ever passed through. In the civil as well as the religious agitation there is noticeable an extraordinary intensification of feeling as the breach between King and Parliament widened, and it was this intensification of feeling that led to the revolution itself. At the opening of the Long Parliament the expectation of change and the determination for it were general, but a much milder reform would have satisfied in December, 1640, than a year or two years later. And this is true of both the phases of the agitation—of the religious as well as the constitutional demands of the nation.

As compared with this rise of principle, the mere accident of the usurpation of the army, and of Cromwell, is insignificant. It is not to be wondered at that the army mastered the Parliament, nor that the victory of the army resulted in the monarchy of Cromwell. It is of much more importance that, when the accident of this usurpation had been swept away, the return was made to the constitutional standard, not of 1639, but of 1641. So much of the work of the revolution, at least, was to endure, and to become the basis of the constitutional progress of the succeeding century.

It is quite as true that the first years of the Long Parliament witnessed a similar intensification of feeling and rise of demand in the religious agitation, that phase of the struggle with which we are more nearly concerned. The general idea of church reform that obtained in November, 1640, had become insufficient and useless in June, 1641, and the scheme of June, 1641, was swept

away by the events of 1642 and 1643. Such a desertion of its original basis makes one hesitate to speak of this as the "Puritan Revolution," for the forms of church discipline and government that were finally adopted were not contemplated by, did not grow out of Puritanism proper. During the years 1640–8 English Puritanism itself underwent a revolution, and the fact must be recognised before the character of the period can be rightly understood.

At the opening of the Long Parliament as much stress was laid upon religious as upon civil grievances, but the attitude of the Parliament was essentially lay—unclerical. In past years the clergy had meddled with secular affairs, in the interest of an unconstitutional executive. It was necessary, therefore, to guard against such a danger in the future—to restrict bishops and clergymen to their spiritual function. Again, Episcopacy had shown itself intolerant of the Puritanism of the parochial clergy. The Commons were resolved to assert and foster that Puritanism. Such were the principles underlying the first legislation of the Long Parliament on matters of religion. But as the breach widened, so did the bounds of these principles. Episcopacy itself, the machinery of government of the State Church, was called into question, and it was resolved to replace it by some less centralised system, which would give a share of the government to the parochial clergy and put an end to the dependence of the bishops upon the Crown. It is probable that, without the necessity of calling in Scotch aid and of adopting the Solemn League and Covenant,

the Long Parliament would have resolved upon a system of church government that might be called Presbyterian, though in a sense very different from that usually conveyed by the term. But events did not permit of such an orderly evolution. The course of the war made it necessary to call in Scotch aid, and the condition of obtaining it was the adoption of the Covenant. The main facts of the result are well known. The Parliament was pledged to the adoption of Presbyterianism, and all through the years 1643–8 the work of its establishment was in progress in various stages. In many parts of the country the Presbyterian system was not set up; wherever established, there were restrictions on the power of the Presbyteries such as were unknown in Scotland; but with these limitations it still remains a fact that the period witnessed a real attempt at the enforcement upon the English nation of a Presbyterian system. Abstractly considered, the phenomenon is among the most remarkable in English History. The main feature of a rigid Presbyterian system is the censorial power exercised by the Presbytery. The Scottish Kirk session and the English Congregational Presbytery of the year 1647, took cognizance of the morals of the congregation, held investigations in regular form, and decreed punishment by suspension; being further impowered to call in the civil arm for the enforcement of this sentence. No system could be found more repugnant to the essence of English civil, constitutional, and national sentiment, and the attempt at its enforcement during the civil wars was nothing less than a blind conflict with that national

sentiment. This, too, was at a time when there were in the minds of men vague and visionary notions of freedom nourished by the wars. Hence the abnormal nature of this English civil-war Presbyterianism, as judged from the point of view of the nation at large.

Nor is its strangeness less striking when viewed from the standpoint of clerical feeling merely. There have been only two occasions in the history of English Dissent on which the Puritan clergy have favoured a Presbyterian system. The one was under Elizabeth, the other was the case in point during the civil wars. In both cases the movement stands apart from the general body of Puritan sentiment—from the general stream of Puritan protest. The broad principle underlying sixteenth and seventeenth century Dissent was Puritanism merely, a spiritual perception expressing itself at different times in different forms — in the early days of the Reformation in scruples as to the vestments and the rubrics that seemed to savour of Popery; later, in the merely scholastic Sabbatarian controversy; later still, in a rigid Calvinism as opposed to an apparently laxer doctrine of Grace, and again later in the inculcation of greater morality of life and greater regard for the means of Grace and the Lord's day, as opposed to the immorality and the Sunday sports of the England of Charles. And this continued to be the main basis of English Puritanism even under the explosions of Elizabethan and civil-war Presbyterianism. The Presbyterianism of the days of Elizabeth was an academic movement principally, never in a national sense a clerical movement.

It was apparently confined to three counties and London, and to a small portion of the ministers even of these counties. Wherever organised as a system, it was tentatively only, and in secret, and the agitation was quickly stamped out. There are no traces of any inheritance of the ideas or influence of this Elizabethan Presbyterianism by the English Puritans of the days of James I. and Charles I. The Presbyterianism of the civil war was a more vital and concrete phenomenon, but none the less was it an abrupt and illogical expansion from the basis of English Puritanism. So vivid was Baxter's perception of the essential nature of this Puritanism that he could not recognise the real existence of a Presbyterian system or party. "Though Presbytery generally took in Scotland," he says, "yet it was but a stranger here, and it found some ministers that lived in conformity to the bishops' liturgies and ceremonies (however they might wish for reformation), and the most that quickly after were ordained were but young students in the universities at the time of the change of church government, and had never well studied the points on either side; and though most of the ministers then in England saw nothing in the Presbyterian way of practice which they could not cheerfully concur in, yet it was but few that had resolved on their principles; and when I came to try it I found that most that ever I could meet with were against the *jus divinum* of lay elders, and for the moderate primitive Episcopacy, and for a narrow congregational or parochial extent of ordinary churches, and for an accommodation of all

parties in order to concord." (*Autob.*, i. 146) On the statement of fact Baxter's testimony will be found to break down in more than one instance. The significance of these words lies in their tone. They represent Baxter's attitude and the attitude of many others; they are the expression of the constant element of Puritanism, as opposed to the mere accident of this Presbyterianism.

From the point of view, therefore, both of the Puritan clergy and of the nation at large, the Presbyterianism of the civil war is a unique and strange phenomenon. It is the object of the following pages to explain its actual inception and genesis. But for the moment, speaking only of results, we note a wide difference between the effects of this, the religious side of the development of the time, and those of the civil development already alluded to. The latter were slowly but surely beneficial: the former were as surely, and more swiftly, injurious in effect.

Such a statement may appear paradoxical. We recall at once the many testimonies as to the religiosity of the Commonwealth period, and in contrast to it of the licence of the Restoration times. But that is another and a separate question. There is no accounting for the ebb and flow of the tide of human immorality. The problem set before the mind of the England of the civil wars was very different. It was this—the evolution of some system of church organisation that would give freedom to the Puritan clergy in their scruples and in their missionary tendency, while preserving the unity and consolidation which the

age still deemed essential to the national safety and existence. The mind of the age (always excepting its master spirit, Cromwell) could not grasp the idea of toleration, but it could have made an attempt at comprehension. Several schemes for it were propounded in 1641, and again in 1661—Usher's, Williams's, Baxter's, Hammond's. But the proposals of 1641 were shattered by the necessities of civil war, and in 1661 the triumph of Episcopacy was again complete. What, then, is the result? It is twofold. (1) The opportunity for a comprehension did not recur for almost two generations, and when it did it was due only to the growth of secular opinion. The credit of it, therefore, does not belong to the clergy of the Establishment, a fact that is all the more to be regretted because in matter of doctrine our later age has more sympathy with Arminianism than with the Calvinism of English Puritanism. The work of the Westminster Assembly hardened that Calvinism, whereas the only hope for a healthier spiritual life was in the contact of such a system of belief with the more human sentiment of the growing generation. That the chance of such a contact has not been afforded is to be attributed to the action of the Puritan divines of the Westminster Assembly, and of the Episcopal potentates of the Savoy Conference.

(2) By deserting their true character and adopting the Presbyterian system, in some cases with passionate belief in its divine institution and in every case with a clerical zeal for the exercise of disciplinary power of suspension, the Puritan clergy unfitted themselves for

reconciliation with the Episcopal system at the Restoration. Had Archbishop Usher's scheme been made the foundation of the church system during the years 1643–60, how many of the clergy would have been driven out by scruples at the Restoration, even upon a complete revival of Episcopacy? Probably very few in comparison with the number of those who eventually turned out in 1662. The consequences are far-reaching. Destitute of this, its most fervent spiritual element, the Church of England sank into an apathy from which it was only redeemed in the next century by its rejected Wesley. Destitute of a recognised employment, Dissent sank into Conventicleism. The light and power of English Puritanism was extinguished. It is generally contended that by this scattering of the truth light shone into many a dark corner of the land which would otherwise have missed the preaching of the gospel. But the history of any of the dissenting churches of the times after the Act of Toleration lead to a different and more painful conclusion. The main idea of those churches was that of membership—the maintainence and perpetuation of a body of church members; and that idea was the inheritance of the recusants of 1662—of the Presbyterian clergy, who had once fatally learned to wield the wooden sword of excommunication, and who would not relinquish the power or the idea. Such churches do not fulfil the work of a Christian church.

It is thus that this brief period of civil-war Presbyterian rule has fatally influenced English religious history by taking the life-purpose and spiritual fervour out of its

Puritanism. English Puritanism received its death-blow, not in 1662, but in 1645.

But, apart from these wide-reaching results, the immediate problem before us is only to explain the growth of this Presbyterian movement and party, and to show the nature of the revolution, for such it really was.

In November, 1640, the general frame of mind in the country, as in the Parliament, was negative, not positive —destructive, not constructive. There were grievances existing in certain aspects of the church system, inseparably linked with that system. There were men, too, who had been instruments and promoters of those grievances. On these points there was no hesitancy. But the notions of a new state of things were vague. In the opening harangues the subject of religious grievances was only one amongst the rest—civil, judicial, parliamentary—and a large part of the consideration which the purely religious question received in those harangues was devoted to the expression of fear as to a universally suspected Popish plot. The first real debate in the House on religion assumed a purely legal form. The question of the validity of the Canons of 1640 turned upon matter of law and precedent; and it was not till the debate in February on the London petition that the more crucial point of church government was at all approached, and it will be seen that then the House showed signs of a wish to avoid the debate.

It is not difficult to conjecture what would have been the course of action adopted if the breach between King and Parliament could have been repaired. Personal

retribution would have been dealt out. The temporal jurisdiction of the bishops, their courts, their seats at the Council table and votes in the Lords' House, and generally the sitting of clergymen on commissions of the peace, would have been abolished or reformed; the manner of ordination would have been altered, and finally a toleration established with regard to the ceremonies of the service—or, rather, the service-book itself reformed, and the obnoxious ceremonies taken away, together with all the ritualistic and superstitious innovations of previous years.

All these points will be evident from a survey of the debates of the first session.

But further than this I do not think the Parliament would have gone. The liturgy would not have been fundamentally altered; the frame of Episcopacy would have been reduced to a more primitive purity and simplicity, but otherwise suffered to stand; and therefore, Root-and-branch—or, later, Presbyterian—ideas would not have been broached.

A similar conclusion may be safely drawn as to the state of feeling in the country at large. It is not to be denied that, as events proved later, there already existed in the country a Root-and-branch party. It appears from Baillie's letters that the London petition had been started *immediately* after the meeting of the Parliament, and that at the same time, or very shortly after, petitions of a like nature were got up in Kent, Essex, and ten or eleven counties. But in November, 1640, the general feeling, as evinced in the petitions,

was not that way. As to the clergy, the best statement of their position is given in the well-known Petition and Remonstrance. Two months before that petition was presented a similar one had been preferred by two beneficed clergymen on behalf of many of the clergy of Lincoln. This latter complained of the increase of Popery, the renewing of idle and frivolous ceremonies, and the canons, and prayed that thereafter no canons should be made without consent in Parliament, that marriage might be lawful at all times, and that some severe law might be enacted against . . . the profanation of the Lord's day.[1] The petition from the churchwardens and sidesmen of London of the same date, complained of the articles of visitation and the oath of presentment exacted from churchwardens. The names of eight other petitions which were delivered in on these days (Nov. 9th and 10th), are preserved in the Journals. They concern the removing of the communion table, the railing of it in, the oath, and the articles put upon churchwardens and sidesmen, false doctrine and irregularities of the clergy. Besides these matters there were private petitions relating to cases of injustice in the High Commision, or from the bishops' ordinaries.[2]

It is in these petitions, rather than in those that advocated the abolition of Episcopacy, that can be discerned

[1] D'Ewes's *Diary*, i. 8, November 16; *Harl. MSS.*, 162, B.M.

[2] The number of these private petitions by June 15th, 1641, was not less than 900. D'Ewes's *Diary*, iii. 1021.

the true measure of reformation desired by the country at large; and it is in this element, vaguely conservative and moderate, that we notice with the lapse of time and the progress of events the change of attitude and intensification of feeling which was so characteristic of the Parliament itself. The mind of the *laity* at the beginning of the session, was expressed in the petitions which poured in from the counties on the general subject of grievances. The names of fifteen counties which preferred petitions by the 9th November are given in the Journals and Rushworth. Some of them are preserved (those from Hertford, York, and Kent), and we may safely conjecture a similarity of nature in all. The substance of the Dorset petition was given by word of mouth by Lord Digby in one of those set speeches on grievances which will be noticed immediately. "There was given to us in the county court at the day of our election a short memorial of the heads, that we might represent them to the Parliament—(1) ship money; (2) pressing soldiers, and raising monies concerning the same; (3) monopolies; (4) the new canons and the oath to be taken by lawyers and divines, etc.; (5) the oath required to be taken by church officers to present according to articles new and unusual."

The religious questions here raised are evidently subordinate in position and of small intrinsic importance as religious questions. Now, in this matter of county petitions alone, the rise of feeling is very noticeable. Sixteen months later the Lords, after having previously

refused to sanction a similar measure, passed the bill concerning ecclesiastical persons (taking away the bishops' votes in Parliament and disabling all persons in holy orders from exercising any temporal jurisdiction). On this occasion a petition went from Kent to the Lords, acknowledging with joy the good correspondence between Lords and Commons in passing the bill for the bishops' jurisdiction; "and we pray you will go on with them to a thorough reformation, especially of the church *according to the Word of God.*"[1] During the agitation on this bill no less than twenty counties presented petitions praying for the passing of the measure, or returning thanks for it, in almost identical words.

The extent and the significance of this rise in the popular feelings can be traced in the history of the struggle and in the parliamentary debates. The Parliament met on the 3rd November, 1640. The first set debate was on the subject of grievances, and was opened on the 7th by Harbottle Grimston, the very embodiment of a constitutional Conservative. With him the question of parliamentary privilege preceded the question of religion, and under this second head his attention was given almost entirely to the conduct of the late synod, its canons, and the oath.[2] "They would have us at the very first blush swear to a damnable heresy, that matters

[1] L. J., iv. 571.

[2] The speech is given in Rushworth, iv. 34, but wrongly assigned to the 9th. D'Ewes's *Journal* corrects it.

necessary to salvation are contained in the discipline of our church . . . and they would anticipate and forestall our judgment by making us swear beforehand that we would never consent to an alteration. Nay, they go further, for they would have us swear that the government of the church by archbishops, bishops, etc., is *jure divino*. Their words are 'as by right it ought to stand,' whereas we do not meet with the name of archbishop, bishop, dean, or archdeacon in all the New Testament. And whatsoever may be said of the function of bishop, it is one thing, but for their jurisdiction it is merely *humana institutione*—they must thank the King for it." After referring to the boldness of the synod in granting a benevolence, he thus concluded : " They which durst do this will do more if the current of their raging tyranny be not stopped in time. Who are they that have countenanced and cherished Popery and Arminianism to that height it hath grown to in this kingdom ? . . . Who are they that of late years have been advanced to any preferment in the church, but such as have been notoriously suspicious in their discipline, and for the most part vicious in their lives ? . . . Therefore, to put ourselves in a way for our redress and relief, I conceive it were fit that a committee might be named to take these petitions into their consideration . . . that the parties grieved may have just reparation . . . and that out of them laws may be contrived and framed for the preventing of the like mischiefs for the future."

Grimston was followed by Rudyard, who spoke of the discountenance thrown upon the Puritan clergy ; by the

fiery Sir Francis Seymour, who spoke little on the head of religion, and under that head only of the danger from Jesuits—that aspect of the question which seems to us the least real; and by Pym who manifested the same fear of the Papists, and concluded by alluding to the corrupt part of the clergy—"favourites such as for preferment prize not conscience . . . and, worse than Papists, these are willing to run into Popery; and these, though severed, aim at one end, and to their achievement walk on four feet—at first softly, now by strides—and are near their ends if they be not prevented. The first foot is ecclesiastical courts—their action in discountenancing of preachers and virtuous men whom they persecute under the law of purity—their countenancing of preachers of a contrary disposition . . . and their frequent preachings and instructions to preach up the absolute monarchy of kings."

It is needless to indicate further the nature of the debate. Pym had commenced his speech by moving for "a reformation, finding out the authors of these grievances and punishing them." Bagshaw concluded his similarly, thus: "In the interim, let them be made examples of punishment who have been the authors of all these miseries." This merely general debate on grievances was continued on the 9th, on the occasion of the presentation of petitions from the counties. And it was in this connection that Digby delivered to the House the message from Dorset already noticed. His condemnation of "such discontient divines" and of the conduct of the late synod was as vehement as any man's, and yet

his subsequent change of attitude will be borne in mind. He was followed by Sir John Culpeper—destined likewise to a change of front. In the debate of the following year, when Episcopacy was assailed, Culpeper was its warmest supporter, but in these early general debates his condemnation of the canons and the ceremonies was clear and resolute.

The result of the debates was the appointment on the 10th November of the committee of twenty-four for a declaration on the state of the kingdom, and a motion to refer the book of new canons to examination by the Grand Committee for Religion.

These debates are very indicative of the attitude of the House. They show how small a place the questions which were later to agitate the Commons so violently—questions of church government and service—had in the mind of this Parliament at its commencement, and how vivid, on the other hand, was its sense of the delinquency of particular members of the existing ecclesiastical system, and of the impolitic severity of the recently enacted canons. Such were the points that attracted the attention of the Parliament at this time.

On the occasion of the first report from this Grand Committee for Religion, bitter speeches were made by Sir Edward Dering and Sir John Wray. The former instituted an elaborate comparison between the High Commission and the Inquisition, the latter calling upon the House "to lay the axe to the root of the long and deep fangs of superstition and Popery" by moving "that

the groves and high places of idolatry may be removed and pulled down." [1]

But as yet the interest of the Commons was confined to the action of the late Convocation. It was determined first to pass a condemnation upon that. After three adjournments of the debate, which was entirely legal, the House passed resolutions against the canons of 1640 in particular, and against the power of the clergy to make any canons without common consent in Parliament.[2] (15 and 16 December.)

These debates were, however, as has been said, purely legal. As yet the subject of religious reformation had not been broached in the full House, and the first notice of the question is significant from its timidity. In the course of the previous week, 12th December, 1640, the Grand Committee for Religion

[1] 25th November, Wednesday. Rushworth, iv. 55; *Parl. Hist.*, ix. 147.

[2] The subsequent proceedings against the bishops were based upon these resolutions. In March, 164$\frac{0}{1}$, it was argued that the clergy had incurred a præmunire, and on April 27 an Act was introduced for punishing and fining the members of the late Synod. (See the list of fines in Rushworth.) This was replaced on the 3rd June by a bill for making void certain canons, and for the punishment of such prelates as were the makers of them. This was adopted by the Lords on the 12th June, 1641, and it was on this that the form of impeachment was drawn up against fourteen bishops. (C. J., ii. 165; *Verney Notes*, Camden Society, p. 83; D'Ewes's *MS.*, ii. 657.) Finally, the impeachment on this ground was not proceeded in, a fresh prosecution being instituted on the occasion of the withdrawal of the bishops from the Lords' House. (December 30, 1641.) The House returned to the subject of the canons and the punishment of Convocation in 1642, but the outbreak of the war brought other issues to the front.

had named a sub-committee to inquire into the state of religion in general. This committee reported to the Grand Committee, and on Monday, the 19th December, the Grand Committee reported to the House. According to their report,[1] the sub-committee had selected three points for consideration — (1) to inquire what is the cause of the decay of preaching; (2) of the increase of Popery; (3) of scandalous ministers. The House ordered that the sub-committee should be turned into a select committee—*i.e.*, directly from the House itself—and to meet forthwith. It is indicative of the vague views and faltering attitude of the Parliament in its earliest months on this question of church and religious reform that on the 11th December, the very day before the House adopted this report from the Grand Committee, the London petition against Episcopacy had been presented. In its own words, this notorious petition prayed "that the government of archbishops, lord bishops, deans, archdeacons, etc., and their courts and administrations in them, with all its dependencies, roots, and branches, may be abolished, as dangerous to the church and commonwealth, and the cause of many foul pressures to the subject in liberties and estates and the true government according to the Word of God established." To this was appended a list of twenty-eight grievances in the existing government, which may be noticed later. The petition was signed by 15,000 hands, and not less than 1,500 gentlemen of quality and worth attended in Westminster Hall on the day of its delivery.

[1] D'Ewes's *Diary*, i. 87.

Only a slight debate greeted the appearance of this petition, the existence of which had been known some time. (Baillie had seen and read the petition as early as the 17th November.)[1] Sir Miles Fleetwood and Stroud spoke generally and vaguely for a careful consideration of religion as the chiefest pillar of happiness. The Puritan D'Ewes was much more explicit. He did not deny there was much chaff in the petition, but he found some wheat in it also. D'Ewes's views on the church and religion were, like those of many of his contemporaries, critical and not constructive. On almost every occasion on which we find him speaking on religion he takes pains to draw a distinction between ancient and godly bishops, whom he reverenced, and the bishops of his own "degenerate" days, who had had their minds and morals corrupted by the addition of their temporal baronies. This reference to the primitive bishops and to the New Testament as a model was universal at this time, and as a mere matter of opinion on the face of it correct and satisfactory, but it was a vastly different and less feasible idea to make this the basis of action, the foundation of a system to be constructed. "Doubtless," said D'Ewes, "the government of the church of God by godly, zealous, and preaching bishops hath been most ancient, and I should reverence such a bishop in the next degree to a king. But I protest in the presence of God that if matters in religion had gone on twenty years longer as they have done of late years there would not in the issue so much

[1] Rob. Baillie's *Letters*, i. 273.

as the face of religion have continued amongst us, but all should have been overwhelmed with idolatry, superstition, ignorance, prophaneness, and heresy. As I allowed ancient and godly bishops, so I disliked their baronies and temporal honours and employments."

All the speakers who followed D'Ewes, with the exception of the Treasurer of the Household (the elder Vane), favoured the reception of the petition, and it was finally resolved that all the petitions should be considered of on a certain day—the following Thursday.

There was a notable unwillingness on the part of the House in general to approach the consideration of this petition and of the general question of the government of the church—of Episcopacy. The debate on it did not actually occur until the 8th of February, although the existence of this petition had been known, as has been said, a month, and probably more, before it was presented. Writing on the 18th November, Baillie states[1] that "the town of London, a world of men, mind to present a petition, which I have seen, for the abolition of bishops and all their appurtenances. It is thought good to delay it till the Parliament have pulled down Canterbury and some prime bishops, which they mind to do as soon as the King has digested the bitterness of his lieutenant's censure. Huge things are here in working. The mighty hand of God be about this great work. We hope this shall be the joyful harvest of the tears which this many years have been sown in this kingdom. All here are weary of bishops."

[1] Baillie's *Letters*, i. 273.

In a later letter, on the 2nd December, he informs the Presbytery of Irvine that "the petition against Episcopacy, subscribed with some thousand hands, had been given in and pressed hard before now had not friends in both Houses, as more than two parts are, advised to spare the pressing of that conclusion till first they had put the whole bishops and their Convocation in a præmunire for their last illegal canons, which now they are about, also till they have brought down some of the prime bishops for prime faults, which they have not will to essay till they have closed the Lord Deputy's process."

On the day after the presentation of the petition he writes as follows:—"It was resolved that the petition against Episcopacy, Root-and-branch, should be delayed till first we had gotten Canterbury down and the Parliament had removed all the rest out of the House by a præmunire for their canons; yet we are so delayed by Traquair's fencing for his own head ere we can come to the minor [of the syllogism], where Canterbury stands to be concluded, as we hope, in a deep bocardo, that the people's patience could no longer keep in. So yesterday a world of honest citizens, in their best apparel, in a very modest way went to the House of Commons, sent in two aldermen with their petition—subscribed, as we hear, by 15,000 hands—for removing Episcopacy, the service-book, and other such scandals, out of their church. It was well received. They were desired to go in peace and to send three or four of their number on Thursday next to attend some answer. Against that time, God

willing, we will be in hand with his little Grace, and sundry petitions of several shires, to every one of which some thousand hands are set, will be given in against Episcopacy."

Now these petitions from the counties were not presented to the House until the 13th of January, and it seems certain that only the unwillingness of the House delayed them so long; and even then the subject remained in quietness for a month further. It would seem that the state of opinion was wavering on the question. Men's minds were made up as to the grievances of the present ecclesiastical system, but as to the reformation of them there was a difficulty. It was easier to destroy than to build again. Mr. Gardiner ascribes this conduct to consciousness of weakness on the part of the Root-and-branch party. That is so, but their weakness was not as against a party devoted to Episcopacy and the liturgy, but as against one bent on reform, yet with no clearer idea of reform than a vague wish for the restoration of primitive Episcopacy. The House as a body had not made up its mind on that question, and independently and of its own accord it never did. Before the debates on these petitions in February there were several occasions on which the action of the Commons displays its disposition, and verify the above statement.

On Friday, the 8th January, 164½, the Subsidy Bill was under consideration. On this occasion certain doctors of divinity were found to have been inserted in the list of commissioners for the town of Cambridge. A one-sided discussion arose as to the exclusion of these

names from the list. As far as can be seen, all the speakers were in favour of the motion. D'Ewes impatiently declared that in his opinion the matter deserved no longer debate, for it had been the old grievance of England that clergymen intermeddled with secular affairs, "and it was a great grievance now to be remedied, and therefore we should much prejudice ourselves now to admit it. So after one or two more had spoken to it, all the clergymen were struck out." [1]

So clearly defined was the negative attitude of the House; but the moment it had to depart from this attitude and face the responsibility of a reformation its action was paralysed by differences of opinion and by the consciousness of the vagueness of its own aims. Four days later the Commons were called upon to consider the report concerning the standing or otherwise of certain committees. The question was proposed that the Grand Committee for Religion should continue to exist, and should take into consideration the action of the ecclesiastical courts and the government of the church as it now stands, and present it to the House. There was, to all appearance, no division of opinion as to the first of these agenda, but the second was demurred to. It was proposed to substitute the phrase "irregularities of the government" for the word "government." In the end neither phrase was adopted, but another circumlocution invented "the government of the church as it is now exercised;" and this was not until after some debate, and with the

[1] D'Ewes's *Diary*, i. 131; Harl. *MSS.*, 162.

admission of such palliatives as that with which D'Ewes concluded his speech in favour of the word government.[1] "Nor doubt I," said he, "however the question were put, whether of government or of the irregularities of the government, we should proceed with that discretion and moderation as to question nothing but what were fit to be questioned."

How long the Commons, thus undecided in their policy, would have postponed the consideration of the subject of Episcopacy cannot be conjectured, but in this matter the House was not entirely master of itself. On the 13th of January the resumption of the subject was moved by Sir Edward Dering. The occasion was the presentation of a petition with which he was entrusted from his county, Kent. The matter of it is identical, the wording almost parallel, with that of the London petition.

"By sad experience we do daily find the government in the Church of England by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, with their courts, jurisdictions, and administrations by them and their inferior officers, to be very dangerous both to the church and commonwealth, and to be the occasion of manifold grievances to the subjects, their consciences, liberties, and estates. The dangerous effects of this lordly power hath appeared in their overruling with a hard hand all other ministers, the suspension of many godly preachers, and restraining

[1] The resolution in D'Ewes, i. 138, says simply, "the proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts and the government of the church." Both the Commons Journals, ii. 66, and Nalson, i. 719, say "the government of the church as it is now exercised."

the lawful preaching of others, both for lectures and for afternoon sermons on the Sabbath day; their encouragement of Papists' ceremonies and commendation of the Church of Rome; their enforcing antiquated ceremonies and the oath; their dispensation for plurality of benefice and abuse of the ordinance of excommunication; their claim of divine right for their office and jurisdiction, and assumption of temporal honours and offices in the commonwealth; and the iniquitous and illegal proceedings of their courts."

"It is therefore prayed," the petition concludes, "that this hierarchical power may be totally abrogated, if the wisdom of this honorable House shall find that it cannot be maintained by God's Word and to His glory."[1]

"Among all our business," said Dering, in introducing the petition, "I observe one, a very main one, to sleep *sine die.* It is a business of immense weight and worth, such as deserves our best care. I mean the grand petition long since given in by many thousand citizens against the domineering of the clergy; wherein, for my part, although I cannot approve of all that is presented to you, yet I clearly do profess that a great part thereof—nay, the greater part thereof—is so well grounded that my heart goes cheerfully along therewith. It seems that my county is of the same mind."

2,500 names were appended to this petition.

Another to a like effect was presented on behalf of the county of Essex by Sir William Masham,[2] and at the

[1] Nalson, i. 74; Rushworth, iv.

[2] D'Ewes's *Diary*, i. 142.

same time a petition of a slightly different nature was presented by Sir Philip Porter in the name of divers ministers of the county of Suffolk, desiring some relief from their present burthens.

On the presentation of these petitions there was some difference of opinion as to the appointing of a day for the reading of them. Some were for fixing the day shortly, others for postponing it for some time.

D'Ewes, sanguine and puritanical, was for a speedy consideration of the question. He saw only the "practice of adorations and the heretic preachings, which still continued to deprave the Sabbath day. It would be the greatest glory of his Majesty's reign if we could change the greater part of the clergy from brazen, leaden —yea, and blockish—persons, to a golden and a primitive condition, that their authority might be warranted by their godly example . . . for it is evident that since the prelates have been debased and adulterated by the intermixture of their temporal baronies with their ecclesiastical function all miseries and calamities at home and abroad have fundamentally risen from them."

In the end, Monday, January 25th, was appointed for the reading of the petitions and the discussion of matters in them. Meanwhile the issues of the question were being decided outside the House.

Instigated by the rapid growth and activity of the Root-and-branch party, the moderate Puritan clergy throughout the country determined to supply by one general petition a standard of the reform demanded by them in the name of the moderate majority alike of clergy

and laity. Various petitions, signed in all by 700 to 800 clergymen, were drawn up and sent to London. There they were discussed at a meeting of representative clergy, and their substance was drawn up into one general petition, the separate heads of grievance being appended in detail as a "remonstrance." All the signatures to the separate petitions were then attached to this so-called "Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance," and it was determined forthwith to present it to the House.

No copy of this celebrated paper has survived, but its substance can be gathered from various sources, and from the debates upon it in the Commons.

The Petition contained at least two main heads :

1. Touching matter of doctrine corrupted.
2. Touching "corruption of matter of government in the church."

It would appear from a tract of Dering that the first head of doctrine touched upon the Liturgy and the Prayer-book.[1] "The ministers do complain that the creed is often rehearsed, but they blotted out what they had put in ; that in one place it is overshort, and in one place dangerously obscure."

The Remonstrance consisted of "near fourscore heads," the following being hurried notes of some of them taken in committee :—

1. Church governors and officers are burdensome to all.
2. Bishops not of divine institution, which they challenge.
3. Bishops assuming sole power of ordination and jurisdiction.
4. Largeness of bishops' diocese. The inconvenience of it.

[1] Brit. Museum, E 197, *A Collection of Speeches.*

5. Bishops delegating their powers to deputies, unmeet persons.

6. Bishops encumbered with temporal power and estate.

7. Bishops pretend to be the only supporters of the prerogatives of the King.

8. Bishops claim to be sole pastors in all parts of the diocese.

9. Confirmation by them only.

10. Sole probate of wills.

11. Bishops consecrate churches, etc., and make it necessary.

12. Bishops inhibit marriages at divers times of the year.

13. Bishops compose forms of public prayer containing matter of State.

14. Bishops imposing oath, as of canonical obedience *ex officio*, etc.

15. Bishops enforce subscription.

16. Commendams in bishops' hands.

17. The bishops' charge at consecration, but they observe it not.

18. Scandalous bishops, drinking healths, etc.

19. The burdens of bishops' officers and dependents and servants, being above 10,000.

Other points related to

Irregular presentations to livings.

Enforcing subscription to their opinions before granting institution.

Exaction of exorbitant fees for institution.

Induction often done "clancularlie and slightly."

Notwithstanding institution and induction, ministers are forced to take licences to preach from the bishops, their officials, and commissaries.

They give licences to physicians, midwives, and meat-dressers in Lent, which they have no relation unto as ministers.

They dispense with things unlawful, as pluralities and non-residence.

Some of the other points urged by the remonstrance were the secular employment of bishops, their judicial power in Parliament, in the Star Chamber, in commissions of the peace, and at the Council table, and also the greatness of revenues of deans and chapters. The remaining heads probably comprised the various grievances as to ceremonies and the prayer-book.[1]

Such was the statement of demand of the moderates, and as it stood this petition and remonstrance was to form during the ensuing February and March the basis of the first real action of the House on matters of church reformation. But it was not to pass unchallenged. It was presented to the Commons on Saturday, 23rd January, and on the following Monday petitions similar to that from Kent, calling for the abolition of Episcopacy, were presented from eleven counties—Hereford, Bedford, Sussex, Surrey, Cheshire, Warwick, Suffolk, Cambridge, Gloucester, Buckingham, and Norfolk.[2] Some of these were numerously signed—that from Suffolk with above 4,400 names, that from Norfolk with 2,000, etc. On the Saturday previous (23rd January) it had been determined, after some debate, to read the ministers' petition on the Monday. But on that day came pouring in these very different petitions from the counties. The question, then, was which of these two classes of petitions should

[1] See D'Ewes's *MS.*, i. 184; Commons Journals, ii. 100; *Verney Notes*, p. 4 (Camden Society). In the third volume of D'Ewes there are two sheets which have apparently been misplaced (folios 117 and 129). They certainly refer to this matter.

[2] D'Ewes's *Diary*, i. 166.

be read, and, if both were retained, whether the ministers' petition should not be retained first.

It was later decided to read the ministers' petition on the 1st February. On that day, after wearying itself by an unsatisfactory discussion on the exclusion from the debate of Dr. Eden and Dr. Parry, who had taken the new oath, the House passed to the discussion of the second head of the ministers' remonstrance touching the corruption of matter of government in the church, "in which so many irregularities and wicked oppressions of the bishops and their ministers, which were numbered to be at least 10,000, were set forth, against godly ministers and godly men specially, as it moved all men's hearts that had any religion to a detestation of them." The subject was not opened in debate, Pym moving the appointing of another day for it. It is significant of the later action of the House in adopting the scheme of the Assembly of Divines, that it should on this occasion have postponed the consideration of the first head, touching matter of doctrine, to that touching government, thereby seeming to recognise its own unfitness for that work.[1]

[1] There has been a question as to the authenticity of the remonstrance attached to this petition. The charge was made by Royalist writers (first by Clarendon and after him by Eachard) that a different paper was shown to the ministers subscribing, and that then their names were cut off and appended to the remonstrance. The truth of the affair can be easily discerned from D'Ewes's *MS.*

On the same day as above, Digby informed the House that some of the ministers who signed the petition disavowed the remonstrance. In reply, D'Ewes stated succinctly that the remonstrance had been framed out of several petitions or complaints sent out of several

Clarendon's[1] account is this: "The first malignity which was apparent there was not only in their Committee for Religion, which had been assumed ever since the latter time of King James, but no such thing had been before heard of in Parliaments, where, under pretence of receiving petitions against clergymen, they often debated points beyond the verge of their understanding, but by their cheerful reception of a declaration of many sheets of paper against the whole government of the church, presented by ten or a dozen ministers at the bar, and pretending to be signed by 700 ministers of London and the counties adjacent (and of the London petition, but the House was then so far from being possessed with that spirit that the utmost that could be obtained was

counties, "some being entrusted to draw the said remonstrance out of the said petitions."

When on the following day these disavowing ministers appeared before the House, they were found to be no less personages than Dr. Burgess and Dr. Downing. It was then also found, as can be clearly seen from D'Ewes's narrative, that Digby had, from motives known to himself, caused or magnified the reluctance of these two doctors to avow the petition; for by their own explicit confession, twice repeated, they acknowledged that they avowed and allowed the petition and remonstrance, and only objected to the length of it, having been informed that the length of it would abate the edge of the House. On the other hand, it was shown by seven of the ministers in favour of the petition, who immediately previously had been called before the House (among them being Calamy and Marshall), that the names subscribed to the petition and remonstrance were taken out of the several petitions sent up. It further appears that the extracted petition and remonstrance had then been read "in a large room to upwards of fourscore ministers," Downing and Burgess themselves being of the number.

On the whole, the procedure seems to me to be perfectly legitimate.

[1] I. 285.

that it should not be rejected, etc.), and, for the ministers' declaration, one part of it only was insisted on by them and read to the House, which concerned the exercise of their jurisdiction and the excesses of the ecclesiastical courts; the other parts are declined by many of them, and especially ordered 'to be sealed up by the clerk, that it might be perused by no man' [these commas are Clarendon's, and have no authority], so that all that envy and animosity against the church seemed to be resolved into a desire 'that a bill might be framed to remove the bishops from their votes in the Lords and from any office in secular affairs.'" [1]

The House did not on this occasion at all debate the question contained in the second head of the petition. The only discussion which arose was as to whether the remonstrance, or so much of it as had been read, should be committed or not, and, if referred, then to what committee.[1] Some would have had it committed to a new one to be named, others to the Grand Committee for Religion, and Mr. St. John, newly created the King's Solicitor, moved to refer it to the Committee of Twenty-four. "All agreed that whatsoever committee should take it into consideration should only prepare heads for the House to debate, and that they should also prepare like heads out of the other petitions touching the grievances of the ecclesiastical government." Thus it was moved that similarly heads might be collected for consideration out of the

[1] It was nearly two months before such a resolution was worded. *Vide infra.*

[2] D'Ewes's *Diary*, i. 188.

London petition, and presented among the others. This motion was resisted, and among others by the ever-ready defender of Episcopacy, Sir John Culpeper. He desired that the London petition might not be referred at all, even if the others were, since Episcopacy itself was condemned therein, "and bishops," he declared in his warmth, "are the main columns of the nation." The sentence excited indignation, and would have been followed by a hot discussion but for an interruption of the sitting.

The subject was not resumed until the 8th, and on that and the following day there was a most memorable debate, my view of which differs slightly from that of Mr. Gardiner. There was not intentionally a set debate on Episcopal government; though, owing to a misconception on the part of some of the speakers, portions of the debate read like that. The question was simply that which had already engaged the attention of the House, viz., the referring or otherwise of the Londoners' petition to a committee, as well as the ministers' remonstrance and petition. The resolution which closed the debate definitely reserved the point of Episcopacy itself for the judgment of the whole House. Besides, a committee appointed to prepare materials for debate would, in the ordinary course of things, be allowed to make its report before the House would formally debate the subject of Episcopacy itself—its fitness or unfitness, its retention or otherwise. Any generalisations, therefore, as to the significance of these debates in revealing a separation of parties on this question would seem a little premature, *i.e.*,

antedated. Although as a matter of fact many of the speeches, through misconception, took the form of a debate on Episcopacy, it was not unnoticed. "The only question," says D'Ewes,[1] "was whether the London petition should be committed with the petition and remonstrance, but divers, mistaking the question, fell into a long and large disputation."

The mistake is perhaps to be ascribed to the fright of the Episcopal party. Whatever the immediate cause, the fact itself is very significant. The House *as a whole*, conscious of the indefiniteness of its aims on the point, was not eager to approach the question. The reluctance, therefore, did not merely proceed from a sense of weakness in the anti-Episcopal party. And this view is confirmed by the course of events, for when in March the committee for the ministers' remonstrance made its report nothing that can be called a debate on Episcopacy took place. The votes of bishops in Parliament, their secular power, the revenues of deans and chapters—these were the points touched upon, and on these points men's minds were clear.

I emphasise this, not because it derogates from the importance of the debates, but because it shows the real nature of the prevailing opinions or fears in the House of Commons.

The debate was opened by Sir Benj. Rudyard. He inveighed against the want of simplicity in the clergy, against their Roman ambition of a sumptuous religion with additionals of temporal greatness, and, repeating

[1] D'Ewes's *Diary*, i. 206.

perhaps the very words of the ministers' petition, declared how it behoved to restrain them to the duties of their function, as they may never more hanker after heterogeneous extravagant employment, nor to be so absolute, so single, and arbitrary in actions of moment as excommunication, absolution, ordination, and the like, but to join some of the ministry with them, . . . that they may not have power hereafter to corrupt the church and undo the kingdom. But although Rudyard thus strayed from the point of the debate, and although he thus expressed all that more thoughtful minds in country and Parliament alike had conceived and determined on in the way of reform, he had no thoughts of the destruction of Episcopacy itself, "When they are thus circumscribed, and the public secured from their corruption, I shall not grudge them a liberal, plentiful subsistence, else I am sure they can never be given to hospitality. Certainly, Sir, this superintendency of eminent men, bishops over divers churches, is the most ancient, primitive, spreading, lasting government of the church; wherefore, whilst we are earnest to take away innovations, let us beware we bring not in the greatest innovation that ever was in England. I do very well know what very many do very fervently desire, but let us well bethink ourselves whether a popular democratic government of the church, though fit for other places, will be either suitable or acceptable to a regal monarchical government of the state. Wherefore, Mr. Speaker, my humble motion is that we may punish the present offenders and reduce and preserve the calling for better men hereafter." [1]

[1] Rushworth, iv. 183.

Rudyard was followed by the brilliant Digby, who at first kept more to the real point in debate. "If I thought," said he, "there were no further designs in the desires of some that the London petition should be committed than merely to make use of it as an index of grievances, then I should wink at the faults of it, and not much oppose it." [1]

He allowed that when the petition was first presented there would be more reason for the commitment of it, "as being then the most comprehensive catalogue we had of church grievances, but now that the ministers by their remonstrance have given us so full and fair an index of them, without those mixtures of things contemptible, irrational, and presumptuous wherewith this petition abounds, I do not know to what good end it can be committed. . . . What have we here? A multitude of allegations, a multitude of instances of *abuses* and depravations of church government—and what informed from thence? Let the use be abolished for the abuse's sake."

Like every other speaker, Digby takes occasion to record his indignation against the oppression that had marked the previously existing state of things. But in him it seems to be rhetorical. "Methinks the vengeance of the prelates hath been so laid as 'twere meant that no generation, no complexion, no degree of men, should escape it. Was there a man of nice and tender conscience, him have they afflicted with scandal in adiaphoris," etc. But, rhetorical or not, he did not allow himself to be swayed by his own denunciation. He

[1] Rushworth, iv. 170–4.

proceeded to expose with most subtle ability the difficulties of the situation. "To strike at the root, to attempt a total alteration, before ever I can give my vote to that three things must be made manifest to me—(1) that the mischiefs which are felt under Episcopacy flow from the nature of the function, and not from the abuse of it—*i.e.*, that no rules, no boundaries, can be set to the bishops able to restrain them from such exorbitancies; (2) such a frame of government must be laid before us as no time, no corruption, can make liable to proportionable grievances; (3) it must be made appear that this Utopia is practicable." In dwelling on the second of these demands, Digby uses a phrase that is very significant, as indicative of the almost universal impression of the time that the destruction of one system would be followed as a matter of necessity, and of course, by the erection of another. "If we hearken to those who would quite extirpate Episcopacy, I am confident that instead of every bishop we should put down in a diocese we should erect a pope in each parish, and . . . for my part I do not think that there is any such alliance as men talk of betwixt the Mitre and the Crown but from this reason, that upon the pulling down of bishops the government of assemblies is like to succeed it; that to be effectual must draw to itself the supremacy of ecclesiastical jurisdiction."

Digby was not the only one who turned with discomfort from this alternative. What he was prepared for he stated succinctly enough, and this seems to me the only positive attitude at all taken up by the average moderate member of the earlier days of the Long Parliament. "Let

us not destroy bishops, but make them such as they were in primitive times. Do their large territories offend? Let them be restricted. Do their courts and subordinates? Let them be brought to govern, as in the primitive times, by assemblies of their clergy. Doth their intermeddling in secular affairs? Exclude them from the capacity." He concluded by moving for a standing committee of certain members of both Houses, with such a number of learned ministers as the House should nominate for assistants, to take into consideration all grievances and advise of the best way to settle peace and satisfaction of the government of the church.

He was followed in a similar strain by Falkland.

Like the other speakers, Falkland admitted to the full all the charges brought against the bishops as promoters and authors of grievances, civil as well as religious. "I doubt not bishops may be good men, and let us give good men good rules, we shall have good governors and good times. . . . I am content to take away all those things from them which to any considerable degree of probability may again beget the like mischiefs if they be not taken away. If their temporal titles, powers, and employments appear likely to distract them from the care of, or make them look down upon, their spiritual duty, and that the too great distance between them and the men they govern will hinder the free and fit recourse of their inferiors to them, and occasion insolence from them to their inferiors, let that be considered and cared for . . . I am sure neither their lordships, their judging of tithes, wills, and marriages, no, nor their voices in Parliament, are

jure divino, and I am sure that these titles and this power are not necessary to their authority. If their revenue shall appear likely to produce the same effects, let us only take care to leave them such proportions as may serve in some good degree to the dignity of learning. If it be feared that they will again employ some of our laws with a severity against the intention of those laws against some of their weaker brethren, that we may be sure to take away that power let us take away those laws, and let no ceremonies which any member counts unlawful, and no man counts necessary, against the rules and policy of St. Paul be imposed upon them." With these things thus regulated, and their observation further guaranteed by triennial parliaments, Falkland was persuaded there would be no reason to fear any future innovation from their tyranny, or any defect in the discharge of their duty, and therefore there would be no need on a few days' debate to change an order which had lasted 1,600 years, and with it to change the whole face of the Church. For his purpose, therefore, the committing of so much of the remonstrance as had been read would be a sufficient basis on which to proceed.[1]

Falkland was followed by a man of a quite different cast of mind, and yet who in this matter entirely coincided with him and all the previous speakers. Harbottle Grimston had the same terror of a hasty reformation, and his speech indicates clearly what he thought that

[1] This speech, as given in Rushworth, agrees in *substance* with the extract of it in D'Ewes's *Diary*, but not in the internal *order* of it. I suspect the literal accuracy of *all* the speeches printed in Rushworth.

reformation would be. "I conceive it an easier matter for us *addere inventis*, to reform what is amiss in them and their government than *creare novum*, to set up a new form of government which we have had no experience of, nor do we know how it should suit either with the humours of the people or with the monarchical government; and it may be the new government which is so much desired, if it be brought in upon the grounds and foundations which some would have it, it will be out of our power ever to master it again, whereas the government already established, if the governors exceed their bounds, they may fall into a præmunire." His scheme of reform is identical with that sketched by Falkland. Every branch of the bishops' temporal power he would gladly see abolished —their seats on the bench, at the Star Chamber, and at the Council board, even in Parliament, with the reservation of some to be always present as assistants to give their advice on spiritual matters when required; and the reformation of the High Commission and the official and commissary courts.

The debate had by this expanded from the somewhat narrow point really at issue to a general discussion of the question of Episcopacy, and it was on this wider ground that Nathaniel Fiennes rose to meet the hitherto unanimous course of the discussion. Fiennes was a Puritan, the second son of Lord Saye, the most pronounced Puritan in the Upper House.

He answered perfunctorily Digby's somewhat frivolous objections to the petition itself, and declared he saw no reason why the petition should not be committed, and

then turned to the more general question of the government of the church, as if to the more important and more immediate subject of debate. He touched first upon the general defence of Episcopacy which had been set up by Falkland and Digby.

As might be expected, he easily met the claim of antiquity by a counter reference to the New Testament proofs of the parity of a bishop and a preaching presbyter. It was a stock argument. But it is curious to notice how, when he answers the argument drawn from the probability of danger accruing to the State by the government of the church by assemblies, he tacitly admits the justice of the inference that such and so narrow *might* the alternative come to be as a matter of history; but at the same time he offers a different scheme of his own, a scheme which was subsequently adopted in the Root-and-branch debates, and which indicates clearly how even the Puritan mind of England turned from a pure Presbyterian scheme of government with dread and aversion. "If it shall be cleared, as it is affirmed, that anything herein doth strike at monarchy, I shall never give my assent thereto as long as I live. But, to clear that this is not so, I offer to your consideration that by the law of the land not only all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but also all superiority and pre-eminence over the ecclesiastical state, is annexed to the imperial crown of this realm, and may be granted by commission under the great seal to such persons as his Majesty shall think meet. How if the King should grant it to a certain number of commissioners equal in authority, as he may do? This were an

abolition of Episcopacy, and yet not diminution of monarchy."

He then proceeds to lay down at great length the evils that have resulted from the government and ceremonies of the church. All the points he particularises were urged as freely by Culpeper as by Furnies himself, but they differed in their conclusions. "To speak plain English, these bishops, and deans, and chapters do little good themselves, by preaching or otherwise, and if they were felled a great deal of good timber might be cut out of them for the use of the church and of the kingdom at this time." He therefore moved to consider, not a part only, but the whole matter, and to refer the London petition along with that part of the petition and remonstrance which had been read.

Sir John Wray,[1] Hollis, Pym, Bagshaw, Cage, Goodwin, Stroud, Hampden, Dering, Sir William Strickland, Cradock, Reignolds, Sir John Clotworthy, Sir Ed. Hungerford, Sir Nevil Poole, Mr. Isbister, Sir Walter Erle, Sir Ed. Mildmay, Sir John Evelyn, Mr. Peard, Sir Ed. Mumford (Mountford), Maynard, Crew, Chadwell—all these, by far the majority of the talent of the House, followed Fiennes in his motion to have the London petition committed. In comparison with these the opposing list is in matter of talent very insignificant—Mr. Comptroller Hyde, Waller,

[1] D'Ewes, iii. 916. There are two accounts in D'Ewes's *MS.* of these debates; the one is in the first volume, the other is buried in the midst of the third volume. The second is evidently notes taken on the spot, and the foundation of the more expanded but unfinished first account.

Selden, Vane (the elder Vane), Capel, Griffin, Holburne, Bridgeman, King, and Palmer.

A different cast, however, was given to the debate when it was renewed on the following day (Tuesday, 9th February), by the proposition made on the 8th by Mr. Griffin that only some part of the London petition should be referred. This was the origin of the salvo which was made in the first resolution on the 9th, and it was supported by Mr. Treasurer of the Household (the elder Vane). "We all," said Vane, "tend to one end—that was, reformation—only we differ in the way. I desire, therefore, that those words in the petition which strike at the root and branch of it" . . . Here the report ends, but it is plain that Vane desired the exclusion of the words, which was practically identical with the subsequent reservation of the point of Episcopacy. It was evident that the weight of numbers and of opinion lay with the party desiring the committal of the London petition, and accordingly this seemed the only way of escape for the favourers of Episcopacy. Accordingly, on the Tuesday the speeches turned on this point, as to whether there should be any reservation or exception of any point in the referring of these petitions. Palmer and Whitlocke desired to reserve the question of the total abolition. Hollis contended against any such reservation. There are signs on this second day's debate of an increased violence and insolence on the part of the Root-and-branch party. They called out to have the petitions of Gloucestershire and Hertfordshire against Episcopacy read along with that from London, and, taking advantage

of the disorder and misconceptions apparent in the debate, moved that the question to be put should be that of Episcopacy itself. Neither ruse succeeded, although the House was not thereby recalled to a more correct conception of the real matter in debate. It is evident that the turn which the discussion had taken was due to the precipitancy of the extreme members of both factions, —on the one side through vindictive haste, on the other through fear. Sir John Strangeways declared that a parity in the church would necessitate a parity in the commonwealth. The argument provoked Cromwell into so much warmth of expression or attitude that there were cries from several to have him to the bar. Pym, Hollis, and D'Ewes all supported Cromwell on this mere matter of order, and protested against the call, but they said nothing as to his views. The expression of opinion from the acknowledged leaders of the constitutional party was not such. To all appearances Hampden contented himself with announcing his wish to have the petition committed. The single recorded expression of Pym's speech D'Ewes does not even notice. According to a tract written by Bagshaw at the Restoration, Pym expressed an opinion that it was not the intention of the House to abolish either Episcopacy or the Book of Common Prayer, but to reform both wherever offence was given to the people, and if that could be effected and consented to with the concurrence of the people and Lords they should do an acceptable work to the people —such an one, indeed, as hath not been since the Reformation.[1]

[1] Bagshaw, *Just. Vindicat.*, Brit. Museum, E 1019.

All these men voted for the committal of the London petition, and, as will be seen, it was committed, but with a reservation of this point of Episcopacy.

That such was the just and general judgment of the House there can be no doubt; but even if it had not passed in this particular form—even if this point of Episcopacy had not been reserved for the separate and serious consideration of the House itself—it is plain in what sense the moderates wished the committal to be understood. If it was to consider of Episcopacy at all, it was not to consider of its abolition, but of its reformation, and as a matter of fact the committee did as much on this head when it did meet as it would have done if the resolution had passed without any salvo.

The proposal of this salvo was immediately and eagerly accepted by Falkland and Culpeper, and at first was apparently opposed by such speakers as D'Ewes and Bagshaw. Accordingly, the final conclusion has been represented as a compromise arrived at by the leaders of two widely sundered parties. It seems to me an expression of the general sense of the moderates of both parties, or, rather, of the sense of the large and main body of the House, which as yet fell under the head of neither party. For instance, Bagshaw was for the retention of the petition and its committal.[1] But how? "I do distinguish," said he, "of a twofold Episcopacy. The first *in statu puro* as it was in primitive times, the second *in statu corrupto* as it is at this day, and is so

[1] Rushworth, iv. 186.

intended and meant in the London petition. Now, I hold that Episcopacy in this latter sense is to be taken into consideration as a thing which trencheth not only upon the rights and liberties of the subject, but, as it now is, it trencheth upon the Crown of England, in these four points, namely (1) their claims of jurisdiction *jure divino;* (2) their maxim that Episcopacy is inseparable from the Crown of England; (3) the illegality of legislation without the bishops as a third estate; (4) their holding ecclesiastical courts in their own names. Upon these reasons so nearly touching the right of the Crown in point of Episcopacy I am for the retaining the petition, and for a thorough reformation of all abuses and grievances of Episcopacy mentioned in the minister's Remonstrance, which reformation may perhaps serve the turn without alteration of the government of England into a form of Presbytery, as it is in Scotland, France, Geneva, and the Low Countries."

Now what is the difference between this attitude and that of Falkland and Culpeper? I can see none. In both a reformation of the "corrupt Episcopacy" (*i.e.* its excrescences) was intended—in neither was it intended to touch the "primitive Episcopacy" (the institution itself).

In the tract above cited Bagshaw recapitulates his speech at a distance of nearly twenty years. And in spite of a few verbal incongruities the substance of his reiteration entirely confirms the view just advanced. "I openly declared my opinion concerning bishops for establishing them in their function according to law, and I have just occasion to profess to all, as in truth I do, that I was so far from the

very thoughts of destroying bishops that observing at the time of my reading, and divers years before, the great invasions that were made by them upon the common law of England, I knew no other way how to hold them up in their functions and just jurisdiction and in esteem and honour among the people as by reading in that law which gave them their just bounds and limits, and my sticking close to this opinion, and abhorrence of taking the Scotch Covenant, tending to the utter abolition of Episcopacy, was the alone ground of that load of affliction which lay long upon my body and estate."

The position taken up by D'Ewes[1] was identical with Bagshaw's. "I desired the question might be waived in respect of the ambiguity of the matter, for if by Episcopacy is meant their vain aërial titles of lordship, the spoils of the Crown with which they are loaden, and their vast tyrannical power which they exercise, so as the *totum compositum* of bishops as they now stand and *tota sequela* be meant, I said I just gave my 'aye' for the abolishing of them. But if by Episcopacy is meant only their spiritual function as it stood in the primitive and purest times, then I shall give my negative voice, for I should highly prize a godly preaching bishop, and heartily wish we might make ours such. I desired, therefore, we might first of all, and unanimously, join to remove from Episcopacy those adulterations and admixtures which we disliked, and then I did not doubt that we should so far proceed with conjunction of hearts and minds as there should not

[1] D'Ewes, i. 210.

need to be any division of opinion amongst us. I desired, therefore, we might for the present lay aside the disputes of Episcopacy, or referring it, but refer the London petition as it stood to a select committee."

By this time the sense of the House was apparent, and its judgment a little clearer by the perception of the incongruity of any debate of the question of Episcopacy before the petitions themselves had been referred, much less debated.

Several speakers followed D'Ewes in his desire to waive the question, and, seizing with unerring instinct the general sense of the House, Lenthall begged leave to read an order which he had drawn, and which, with only the alteration of one or two words, was the order subsequently adopted. The final order ran in these words :[1]

Ordered that the Committee of Twenty-four, with the addition of these six—Sir Thomas Roe, Mr. Hollis, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Holborne, Mr. Fiennes, Sir H. Vane—do take into consideration that part of the ministers' remonstrance that has been read, and the petition of the inhabitants in and about the city of London, and other petitions of the like nature that have been read, to prepare heads out of them for the consideration of the House, the House reserving to itself the main point of Episcopacy for to take it into their consideration in due time,"

This action of Lenthall's is indicative of the view taken above. The conclusion was not a compromise arrived at between two irreconcilable factions—between, let us say, Fiennes and Falkland—but the expression of the prevailing feeling of the House through its mouthpiece the Speaker.

[1] C. J., ii. 81.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am speaking of the prevailing tone of the House. I do not wish to create an impression that there was not a Root-and-branch party in the House, nor that there was not *some* common ground on which the Root-and-branch party and the moderates were agreed, *e.g.*, as regards some of the abuses of Episcopacy. Had there not been, the petition would not have been retained at all; and it is probably a sign of some such approximation between Rooters and moderates that in the constitution of the committee the extremists certainly scored a victory. The Root-and-branch men pressed for an addition to the committee of the younger Vane, Hollis, and Fiennes. Three others were named as a counterpoise—Roe, Holborne, and Palmer—but the disparity was so apparent that a division took place, when the nominations were confirmed by 180 to 145.

That this was a victory for the Extremists is evident from Baillie's account. "There was a great commotion in the Lower House when the petition of London came to be considered. My Lord Digby and Viscount Falkland, with a prepared company around them, laboured by formidable speeches and hot debates to have that petition cast out of the House without a hearing, as craving the rooting out of Episcopacy against so many established laws. The other party was not prepared, yet they contested on together from eight o'clock till six at night. All that night our party solicited as hard as they could, and the morrow some thousands of citizens, but in a very peaceable way, came down to Westminster Hall to countenance their petition. It was voiced whether the

petition should be committed or not. By 36–7 voices our party carried it that it should be referred to the Committee of Religion, to which some four or six more were added—young Sir Harry Vane, Mr. Fiennes, and some more of our firm friends."

But this matter was a mere appendage to the debate itself, and by no means alters the view of that debate which I have tried to establish by the above account; and it is very significant that whilst a division should take place on the minor point, the main debate—the adoption of the final order—was not marked by any division.[1]

The committee thus appointed lost no time in meeting. In the *Verney Notes*, edited by Mr. Bruce for the Camden Society, there is a valuable account of a portion of its deliberations.

Its first meeting was on the 10th of February; the report from it was made on the 9th of March. Within these limits "The committee met thrice a week in the afternoon. Some sixteen of the remonstrant ministers attended them.[2] They (the committee) required satisfaction punctually on that head which concerned government. . . . The ministers, by their speaker, Dr. Burgess, gave to the committee full contentment, and so much the greater by my Lord Digby and Mr. Seldon's frequent opposition.

[1] On the 19th February, two other petitions against Episcopacy and the many abuses of their courts, from Cheshire and Devon, were presented to the House, and referred to the above committee, with the same restrictions as above. *Similarly* from Exon 23rd February, Nottingham, Lancashire, Oxford, Buckingham.

[2] Baillie *Letters*, i. 306.

The citizens also made good all the parts of their petition which the committee required to be proved."

"Before this committee every other day some eight or ten of the remonstrants appear.[1] Dr. Burgess is their mouthpiece. We did suspect him of being too much Episcopal. Yet he has carried himself so bravely that we do repent of our suspicions. The passages of the remonstrance that yet has been called for he has cleared to the full contentment of all the committee except Mr. Selden, the avowed proctor of the bishops. How the matter will go the Lord knows. All are for the erecting of a kind of presbyteries, and for bringing down the bishops in all things temporal and spiritual as low as may be. But their utter abolition, which is the only aim of the most godly, is the knot of the question."

I need not repeat my remark as to Baillie's temperament. It influences all his statements of opinion, which are therefore of small value as compared with his statements of fact.

The first two meetings, of the 10th and 15th February, were taken up by a consideration of the second and third heads of the remonstrance :

2. The prelates' claim of divine institution.
3. Their assuming sole power of jurisdiction and ordination.

It would seem as if, for the first three or four meetings, the committee was entirely in the hands of the ministers. Authorities were produced to prove that such a claim of

[1] *Ibid.*, i. 302.

divine right had been made—Bishop Bilson, Andrewes, White, Davenant, Montague, Dr. Pocklington, etc.; and an equally long and significant list of references to Ignatius, Cyprian, and the Councils, was brought forward to prove that in primitive times the bishops did not ordain or exercise jurisdiction alone, and to establish the identity of presbyters with bishops. On the former of these some dispute took place between Selden and Burgess. Of the representations of the Episcopal party we have only one trace—that feeble objection of theirs that in "the work of ordination priests are taken in to ordain with bishops." Such an objection was easily answered, and the proceedings ended in a vote "that the challenges of Episcopacy *jure divino*, as is complained of of in the second article, in the sole power assumed by bishops in ordination and jurisdiction, by virtue of a distinct order superior to a presbyter, is a material head, and fit to be presented to the House."

It is quite typical of the general situation that these points, especially the latter, should have been dwelt upon at such length. The point of the parity or disparity of bishops with presbyters was again debated before the committee on the 17th, when the disputants were evidently, as before, Selden and Burgess. "Wherein," Selden asked, "in persons, places, and causes, consists the difference between a bishop and a presbyter?" (referring, of course, to the existing state of things). Burgess's reply lays down for us the tenets of that party which was to acquire and retain through history the name of Presbyterians.

1. Constantine I. His time we count the primitive time.

2. Consecrations and interdictions of church licences, sitting and ruling in civil assemblies and judicature, or acts concerning matrimony or testament, were not used by bishops or presbyters in ancient times.

In general, all jurisdictions were exercised in common, and not by bishops alone.

For *Persons.*— They were all them that were within the church.

For *Causes.*—Offences in matters of faith or manners, doctrine heretical or schismatical; all offences against God's law so far as they were scandalous in any manner or degree; brotherly admonitions, binding of delinquents, loosing of the penitents.

For *Places.*—Ordinary or extraordinary. The ordinary place was the presbytery or consistory.

The ministers then proceeded in the explanation and defence of the remaining heads of their remonstrance, and Nos. 4 to 7 of these articles were voted by the committee to be material heads, and fit to be considered of by the House.

It was plainly to be seen on which side the weight of argument and sympathy lay, and the exasperation of the prelatical party may easily be imagined. One Richard Flood, a clergyman, who had been present at a meeting of the committee on the 17th, came away in a rage, declaring he had been among a company of rogues who went about to pull down Episcopacy, and vowing to pistol Dr. Burgess with his own hand.[1] Of the remaining heads of the remonstrance Nos. 9–19 were gone through in a similar manner on the 19th February, from which

[1] D'Ewes, i. 236.

date the *Verney Notes* cease on this point, the only other existing record of the debates of this committee being found in D'Ewes.[1]

It would seem that the subsequent debates in the committee up to the making of the report on the 9th of March abandoned the more general ground of the ministers' remonstrance, and in proportion became more aggressive and secular. The matter for these debates, which were probably conducted by the committee without any further reference to the divines, was apparently furnished by the more extreme London and county petitions. For example, at the meeting on the 1st of March the point in debate was the injustice and partiality displayed by the bishops in instituting to benefices.[2]

This will explain the apparent discrepancy between the votes already recorded and the final votes which were reported to the House on the 9th. The latter evince a more extreme and secular character. They show that the committee had referred itself to the divines only on those matters of antiquities and theology of which, in the unanimous opinion of the age, the determination properly belonged to the clergy. But in its judgment of the whole question, from the point of view of State policy and general justice, the opinion of the committee was the average opinion of the secular mind of the day, and the votes indicate clearly on what heads and aspects of the church system the attention of the secular public and the House of Commons was fixed,

[1] D'Ewes, iii. 931.

[2] D'Ewes, *ubi supra.*

and which parts of that system were to be the first to meet a challenge. The report was as follows :—

Die Martis 9 Martii, 164$\frac{0}{1}$.

Mr. Crew reports from the committee for the ministers' remonstrance three heads for the debate and consideration of the House :

1. Their secular employment, by which is intended their legislative and judicial power in Parliament, their judicial power in the Star Chamber and in commissions for the peace, and their employment as privy councillors and in temporal offices.

2. Sole power in ecclesiastical things, by which is intended ordination and censures.

3. The greatness of the revenues of deans and chapters, the little use of them, and the great inconveniences which come by them.[1]

The paper of reasons with which Crew supported these motions is a strange document to be presented to a lay assembly :

The reasons to prove the *first* are—1. That their office is to preach and teach, and not to meddle with secular affairs.

2. Because they are by this made judges of the property, etc., as judges in the Star Chamber, as justices of the peace, etc.

3. By this means they come wholly to neglect matters of the church, contrary to Acts vi.

4. This is contrary to the command of the Apostle,

5. And of the church of Chalcedon, and the constitutions of Ottobon.[2]

The arguments on the second head were :

1 Tim. iv. and 2 Tim. i.—Timothy was ordained by the laying on of hands of the elders. So they are not to have sole ordination.

[1] C. J., ii. 100. [2] D'Ewes, i. 298.

Matth. viii.—Ordination belongs to the church, and that cannot be one bishop alone.

1 Corinth. v.—The Corinthians are commanded to gather together to excommunicate the incestuous person.

"There were several examples vouched of bishops who ordained with their presbytery. So likewise many examples were brought against sole jurisdiction, and there were two canons in Sir Henry Spelman's Councils that the bishop ought not to exercise sole jurisdiction.

To prove the third point or head he brought no reason, because the matter was plain evident."

Owing to other business brought down from the Lords, no set debate on the report took place on the 9th, but the temper of the House was seen significantly in a little incident that occurred. Mr. Pleydall (the constant debater for Episcopacy, and amongst the first to join the Parliament at Oxford) rose to declare that in his opinion the committee had exceeded their powers, and intermeddled too far with Episcopacy.[1] Several answered him roundly in defence of the committee, and at a later stage Pleydall thought it discreet to explain himself, and made some slender satisfaction to the House by saying that he meant no hurt.

I am clearly of opinion that at this time it was in the mind of the generality of the House that the work of reformation could be accomplished by way of this committee. The House did not even let it be supposed that the committee had ceased with this report. On the same day it made an order that the committee should

[1] D'Ewes, i. 299.

have power to send for witnesses, the better to prepare the heads for the House.

The formal debate on this report was eagerly taken up on the following day, March 10, 164$\frac{1}{1}$.

On that day the discussion was opened by Bridgman, son of the Bishop of Chester, with a motion to admit a certain divine (whom upon pressure he allowed to be Dr. Brownrigg) to argue the question of the secular employment of the clergy before the House.[1] He was answered by Selden and others, that as the matter concerned only secular employment there was no need of it; "for sole jurisdiction and ordination we might well have divines."

It is indicative of the waste of energy which characterises this Parliament, due to its want of an organised and recognised leadership, that the House debated at length the *order* of the discussion, finally determining to adopt the following order in debating of the first head of the report — viz.: (1) legislative and judicial power in Parliament, (2) judicial power in Star Chamber and commissions of peace, (3) their employment as privy councillors at the Council table and in temporal offices.

Accordingly this first day's debate was entirely taken up with the discussion of the first branch of the first head, and here again it ran upon the very narrowest lines. The question became entirely one as to the right by which bishops, historically and constitutionally, sit in Parliament; and this not only in the hands of antiquarians

[1] D'Ewes, iii. 937.

such as Selden and D'Ewes, and of lawyers such as Bagshaw, Whitlock, and Glyn, but even of one purely and merely political, such as Pym himself. The only difference of opinion was as to whether bishops sit by tenure of barony or by right of diocese, having ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and as representing the clergy. This latter was the opinion of Selden and Bridgman; but with this exception there was neither opposition nor any deviation from this narrow argument. Even such a speaker as Culpeper, whom we should have expected to raise the debate into a higher plane of sentiment, contented himself with moving to have the question deferred. With equal docility, Pym followed[1] Glyn and others in their conclusion that the bishops could not be representative, and that they sat by one right in the Convocation and by another in the Parliament.

What is stranger still is the contrast between the wording of the resolution as it finally passed and the course of the debate itself. The final form of that resolution was this: "That the legislative and judicial powers of the bishops in the House of Peers, in Parliament, is a hindrance to the discharge of their spiritual function, prejudicial to the commonwealth, and fit to be

[1] With the single exception of a ludicrous comparison of the case of the bishops with that of Jonah. "Though Jonah came into the ship by the Master's command, yet he, knowing he was not doing his Master's command, was to be thrown overboard; so these bishops, if they came in by Christ's commands, as I conceive they did not, and not performing their Lord's commands, are to be extinguished." (Moore's *Diary*, vol. ii. p. 48, folio 313.)

taken away by a bill, and that a bill be drawn for that purpose."

With the exception of a discussion as to the retention or rejection of the word "inconsistent" (predicated of the spiritual functions), found in an earlier form of the motion, and which was finally omitted, no discussion took place on the motives, as laid down in the explanatory part of this resolution. The case is identical with that of the votes on the canons. The secular mind was resolved on the absurdity and iniquity of leaving such power and influence in the hands of churchmen: the Commons therein wisely and faithfully represented the secular mind. The sense of the more fervently spiritual and sternly moral part of the nation was impressed with the beauty of the simplicity of true religious life, with the necessity of such simplicity for the heads of the religious organisation as much as for the lowest unit in it, and with the incompatibility with this of high temporal status and potency. Of this phase of opinion a faithful reflex was found in the House of Commons, and stands expressed to us in their resolution of this day, notwithstanding that there is no apparent justification for it in the course of the debate.

According to Baillie, the votes passed unanimously, "not ten contradicting."

The second head — the employment of the clergy in the Star Chamber and on commissions of peace — was reserved for debate on the following day, Thursday, March 11th, when it was disposed of on equally technical grounds, and still more summarily. The statutes generally reputed as establishing the court were read, 3 Hen. VII.

and 32 Hen. VIII., and in the latter it was noticed that "the clergy are inhibited to intermeddle in secular affairs, and so the matter was soon drawn to a question."[1]

The resolution of the House was: "For bishops or any other clergyman whatsoever to be on the commission of the peace, or to have any judicial power in the Star Chamber or in any civil court, is a hindrance to their spiritual function, prejudicial to the commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by a bill, and that a bill be drawn to that purpose."[2] There is not even a trace that the point of the sitting of clergymen on commissions of peace, included in this resolution, was at all touched upon in the debate.

Owing to the preoccupation of the House with Strafford's trial, the third branch of the first head of the report was not deliberated upon until the 22nd March (Monday), when the House resolved that "for bishops or any other clergyman whatsoever to have employment as privy councillors at the Council table or in temporal offices is a hindrance to the discharge of their spiritual function, prejudicial to the commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by a bill, and that a bill be drawn accordingly."

On the occasion of this debate D'Ewes has preserved a lengthy pedantic speech of his own which images most forcibly the hatred in the secular mind of the interference of the clergy in any department of temporal affairs. At no period in the history of this country has the deserving part of the clergy met with greater reverence and obedience *within their own sphere* than in this age, and at no other

[1] D'Ewes, i. 307. [2] C. J., ii. 102.

period has the revolt—partly popular, still more legal—against clerical interference in matters outside the true domain of their activity, been more strongly and impatiently proclaimed. As might be expected, Hyde and the elder Vane contended that it was the inalienable right of the Crown to select its own advisers. As an antiquarian, D'Ewes could not but see the force and truth of this, but as a Puritan he had made up his mind against it, and D'Ewes was, on this matter, a Puritan first and an antiquarian after.

He roundly asserted that the councils of the clergy had always proved dangerous and fatal. But the weight of his argument lay in the iterated and reiterated necessity of their attending solely to their spiritual function. "I deny not, as it hath been observed by Mr. Hyde, that they might be fit enough to advise at the Council table—yea, more fit, it is to be feared, than to preach—but this drew on a neglect of their other charge, which was more weighty."

Some discussion then ensued upon the second head of the report, concerning sole jurisdiction and ordination. But, conscious of its own want of special fitness for the debate, the House resolved to lay it aside for the present, and in the meanwhile to hear divines on the subject, and accordingly empowered the committee for the remonstrance to hear such ministers as have desired to be heard on the sole power of bishops in ordination, and censure of such ministers, shall they desire it, and to hear such others as they shall think fit. Immediately thereupon it was ordered, on Hampden's motion, to go on with the

third head of Mr. Crew's report—viz., deans and chapters —on the following day. The debate, however, did not come on until Friday, 26th March, when it was opened by D'Ewes.

D'Ewes was taking no mean part in these ecclesiastical debates of the Long Parliament, and his utterances, notwithstanding his pedantry, are typical of the two most important phases of thought in the Commons and in the nation at large: its superstitious reverence for legality of form; and its trenchant secularity, or in other words, the abrupt determination with which it resolved to assert for lay life — for national life — its proper independent sphere of action, and to banish clerical interference. Later in the year the Commons resolved to confiscate the revenues of the church, those of the bishops to the Crown, those of the deans and chapters to good uses; and this was after divines, both Episcopal and Puritan, had been heard before the Lower House, and after both parties (Dr. Burgess as well as Dr. Hacket) had pronounced it sacrilege to convert to secular purposes what had once been consecrated to God. This latter idea was common, and his attempt at overthrowing it is the merit of D'Ewes: "As the deans and chapters are now useless, we may well dispose of their revenues to better uses." He was not certain whether the pious donations of the eleventh century were sacrations to God or the Devil, but he was quite certain that the patrimony of the Crown was as much sacratum as the revenue of the Church. "We are not now singly upon a consideration of the

estates of the Church, but of the estate of the Crown also, for the main question is not between the deans and a common person, but between them and the King. Here is *sacrum patrimonium* against *sacrum patrimonium*."[1]

He was followed in a lower strain of vituperation by Reignolds, Wheeler, and Sir Edward Mountford, to which Falkland could only reply with his habitual argument that the abuse of the institution or the evil lives of certain deans were not reasons for taking away deaneries. In this argument he was followed by Culpeper, who desired to see deaneries made useful rather than abolished, which latter, to his mind, threatened a decay of learning; and D'Ewes assures us that of the many who spake after him most spake to the effect that they might not be utterly abolished.[2]

The debate was adjourned. On the following Monday Culpeper presented to the House a petition from divers deans who desired to be heard in defence of deans and chapters. There was a decided opposition to any reading of the petition at all, but on the following day it was read and the request granted. Owing to the pressing nature of Strafford's business, the divines were not heard for some considerable time; and when, on April 30, it stood with the convenience of the House to hear them they did not appear. On this a very ill-tempered dispute arose, some proposing to go on with the matter without any further reference to them. These were, however, overruled, and Friday, 7th May, was appointed for the hearing. As a fact, it was not until the 12th May that the

[1] D'Ewes, i. 359. [2] *Ibid.*, iii. 948.

hearing actually occurred. On that day there appeared on behalf of deans and chapters Dr. Bargrave, Dr. Hacket, Dr. Ward, Dr. Brownrigg. On the part of the ministers who had signed the remonstrance appeared Dr. Burgess, Mr. Marshall, Mr. White.

The proceedings were opened by an extraordinary request from Dr. Bargrave, Dean of Canterbury, who, after a few general observations in defence of the institution of deans and chapters, demanded that the consideration of the whole question should be postponed, and in the meantime counsel assigned to them. The House declined to take any notice of the request, and then the weight of the defence fell upon Dr. Hacket, at that time minister of St. Andrews, Holborn. He addressed himself to proving "the four points undertaken to be proven by Dr. Bargrave—viz., that deans and chapters conduce (1) to the glory of God, (2) the propagation of the gospel, (3) the advancement of piety and learning, (4) the good of the commonwealth."

There is a remarkable timidity about this defence on the part of the usually trenchant Hacket. In defence of the first "point" he instanced the daily prayers in cathedrals, and yet he was aware that objections were taken as to the manner. The abuse he confessed, and declared that all humbly desired the House to reform the same. In defence of the second "point," he came from prayer to preaching, and felt bound to confess that this had been too much neglected. "They desired that in each cathedral

two sermons [should be preached] each Sunday, and that some lectures [might be prescribed] for the week day which they would perform." The rest of the defence consisted of the usual protestations as to the sacred nature of their property, the glorious estate of the English Church, and the threatening flood of ignorance which would rise on the abolition of deans and chapters.

Dr. Bargrave then delivered a Latin letter from Cambridge, and a petition from the officers of the church at Canterbury, in favour of the continuance of deans and chapters, while Selden preferred a similar one from Oxford.

In the afternoon, after a few more remarks from Hacket, Burgess was heard in reply. His task was easy.

He agreed, as did the whole of his contemporaries, that the points laid down by Dr. Bargrave would, if fulfilled, be a sufficient justification of the institution. The real question was whether such ends were met by it, and, if not, by what could they be met; and it was easy for him, in support of the negative, to point to the objectionable formality of the prayers and music of the cathedrals, to the paucity of the preaching, and to the ease with which provision could be made for the continuance of the grammar schools, etc. But he was entirely at one with his antagonists in claiming for this patrimony of the church a sacred character. "For sacrilege, he acknowledged that it ought not to be perverted, as the casuists and the Puritans hold, to civil uses;" "and so," says D'Ewes, "the divines withdrew,

and some spake to that which they had said on both sides, that they were to hold all the church lands, and we were to have no more."[1]

We can form a tolerably good idea of the scheme that was in the minds of the portion of the clerical party represented by the remonstrant divines and Dr. Burgess from a tract extant among the King's Pamphlets, "Petition of divers of the clergy, . . . with five motions concerning deans and chapters."

The five motions are these :

The deans and chapters may continue with these conditions :

1. That they may be annexed to the parish churches in the great towns where the cathedrals stand.

2. That they may be elected in these places by the King, with the approbation and consent of the people.

3. That they may be enjoined to preach ordinarily twice every Lord's day at their parish.

4. That they may preach every Sunday once or twice in their courses at the cathedrals.

5. That they may be a *concilium* to the bishop in all matters of ordination and jurisdiction, so that nothing shall be done without them.[2]

On the other hand, there was a section of the Parliament that fearlessly advocated confiscation of the greater part of the property to purely secular uses.

[1] For the above account, see D'Ewes, ii. 556; Moore, iii. 518; Rushworth, iv. 269; Nalson, ii. 240. Bruce does not seem to have known of these jottings of Hacket's and Burgess's speeches in D'Ewes's and Moore's *MSS.*; hence his introduction to the debates of this day in the *Verney Notes*, Camden Society, is vague and incorrect in detail.

[2] Brit. Museum, E. 170.

On the very day preceding this audience of the divines the House had been in debate as to the manner of raising £400,000, urgently needed to meet the expenses of the two armies and the Scottish indemnity. On that occasion Peard brought forward a decisive paper scheme. It is worthy of notice :

> The deaneries do possess £28,400 *(old rent).*
>
> £80,400 to be allowed out of this £28,400 to rectories and churches now ill served. £20,000 is left of the old rent before named, worth £200,000 in true value. This let to farm will make £900,000 for twenty-one years and three lives, and this will be a superior way to raise money than any other, and will be a better security than any money granted can be.[1]

Characteristically enough, the scheme received the support of Cromwell.

The House, however, was not prepared to go to such lengths at once. The debate on the dean and chapters was adjourned till Wednesday, 19th May, and on that day it did not take place, though an incident did which shows the apprehensions and distempers of the times. A fright was caused in the gallery by the fall of some plaster, and a rush ensued. Sir Thomas Mansell drew his sword "and came to the door of the House to inquire the cause, conceiving there had been some divisions in the House concerning deans and chapters, which matters had been ordered to have been debated this morning." (D'Ewes)

As a matter of fact, the conclusion on this head of Crew's report from the committee for the ministers'

[1] D'Ewes, iii. 1007.

remonstrance was not arrived at in this connexion. The orderly debates on that report were interrupted by the Root-and-branch Bill, and when later the confiscation of the revenues of deans and chapters was voted it was as a part of the Root-and-branch Bill itself.

The first really effective legislation of this Parliament was, however, the result of the work of this committee for the ministers' remonstrance. In less than three weeks after the resolution on the first head, a bill to take away the bishops' votes in the Lords passed its first reading in the Commons—"An act to restrain bishops and others in holy orders to intermeddle with secular affairs."

Some eagerly pressed for its reading a second time on the same day.[1]

Mr. Gardiner considers this as "a compromise between Falkland and Hampden"[2]—*i.e.*, a compromise manufactured in face of the danger of the army plot, etc.—on a subject as to which there was a division of opinion.

Is there need of such hypothesis? I rather think that from the beginning of the Parliament the national mind at large and the majority of the Commons had determined at least on this item of reform. The production of this bill is only the result of the resolution of the 10th of March, and it has been already noticed what a remarkable lack of strife and life there was in the debates on that resolution. Falkland's and Hampden's are the two names most conspicuous by their absence from the records of that discussion.

[1] D'Ewes, i. 377. [2] IX. 347.

Early in March, before Crew's report on the ministers' remonstrance had been made, the House had desired a conference with the Lords concerning the putting of the clergymen out of the commission of the peace;[1] and the following day (March 2) a bill had been read to disable any clergyman from executing any temporal or lay office as justice of the peace in England and Wales. This bill was read a second time on the 8th of March, and on this occasion (it passed the second reading without any signs of demur), the very day before Crew's report was made, Hollis had moved to add to the bill the taking away of the bishops' votes in the Lords. D'Ewes, with a knowledge of what had taken place at the ministers' committee, opposed this, wishing rather for a separate discussion of that bill: "it would be well if we could have it granted after long debate in this House, and it would deserve a bill alone."[2]

Owing to the later legislation which followed on Crew's report, the earlier bill was considered to be superseded, and was dropped (on the 20th April).[3] But why should not this also be regarded as a compromise between Hampden and Falkland? A compromise with Hampden could only affect two sections of the Episcopal party—(1) the irreconcilables, or ultra Episcopalians, (2) the moderates, led more or less by Falkland. On this particular subject compromise was impossible to the former, just as much as it would be on the whole question of Root-and-branch; and with the latter I take it

[1] C. J., ii. 94. [2] D'Ewes, i. 294. [3] C. J., ii. 125.

that compromise was needless, because they yielded it *ex animo*—if not with the same degree of readiness as the Puritanical party, yet from the same (secular) motives. (*Vide infra.*)

This bishops' bill was read a second time on the 1st of April, and reported on the 16th and 22nd April. On the latter occasion a proviso was added by the House, though opposed by D'Ewes and others, exempting doctors of the two universities from the disability, and allowing them to act as justices of the peace. The bill was read a third time on the 1st of May, and immediately taken up to the Lords, and there read *prima vice*. For almost a fortnight the Lords did nothing with it until the 13th, when, on an impatient message from the Commons, they condescended to read it a second time, and fixed the debate on it for the 20th May. The debate continued for three days, and on the 24th the House came to a composite resolution. It repealed the bill as far as it related to the bishops' seats in Parliament, but adopted that portion of it which related to the Star Chamber :

Resolved, that the archbishops and bishops shall have suffrage and voice in the House of Peers in Parliament.[1]

Resolved, that the archbishops and bishops shall not have suffrage and voice in the Star Chamber when they are called.

Three days later—on the 27th May, the very day on which the Root-and-branch Bill was first read in the Commons—the Lords, anxious to explain the nature of their act, appointed a committee to draw heads for a

[1] L. J., iv. 250.

conference with the Commons. The paper, as reported by the Earl of Bath, is exceedingly interesting :

Whereas the House of Commons have said in their preamble of the bill that archbishops and bishops, and other persons in holy orders, ought not to intermeddle in secular affairs, after long debate and consideration their Lordships considered that by these words "ought not" they understood, not unlawfulness by any law, but conveniency or inconveniency; and among other reasons one principle did arise from the bill, for this House conceived that if they thought it absolutely unlawful they would not have put in these two provisos for the heads of colleges and for such persons in holy orders to whom titles of nobility shall descend. For their right to vote in Parliament their Lordships conceive that by the common and statute laws of this realm, and by ancient and continued practice, they have unquestionable right.

For inconveniency, their Lordships yet understand not any such for certainty and weight that will induce them to deprive them and their successors of that right ; but if there be any to be given by the House of Commons, this House shall at a conference with them willingly hear and take them into consideration.

For the bishops having no votes and suffrages in the Star Chamber, for their not being of His Majesty's Privy Council, for their not being justices of the peace, commissioners in secular offices, otherwise than in performing their duty as they are directed by law in some special cases, as plenary of benefice, loyalty of marriage, and some others, for their not having or enjoying any judicial place in any temporal court, this House hath fully assented.

Only it hath been offered to their Lordships, on behalf of the bishops, that some consideration may be had of them in some particulars, as for the Dean of Westminster to have that

corporation confirmed by Act of Parliament; for the Bishop of Durham, Ely, and the Archbishop of York for Hexhamshire, and for all in keeping court leet, and barons by their stewards, and all other courts that are executed by temporal officers, as formerly they have done, which their Lordships conceive not contrary to the meaning of this bill.

The conference was held, and in answer the Commons determined to prepare reasons in defence of their vote. These were reported to the House exactly a week later.

This paper is important as a statement of the opinion of the House (and the Commons even ordered it to be printed), and also for another reason, which is this: As originally reported by Pierpoint, the paper contained eight heads or arguments; but, according to D'Ewes,[1] "The Lord Falkland, Mr. Nath. Fiennes, and one or two more, gave some new reasons to be added to those former whilst we were voting the first six, and so it was ordered that they should retire into the committee chamber and draw those reasons, which they did accordingly." It can easily be seen, from a comparison of the two forms of the paper, that articles 7, 8, 9 of the final paper emanated from this strange combination—Falkland and Fiennes. The following is the final form of it (in the Commons Journals the final form of the paper is printed before the recommitment of it. The correction is due to D'Ewes, ii. 656):—

Reasons of the House of Commons why bishops ought not to have votes in the House of Peers:

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 651.

1. Because it is a very great hindrance to the discharge of their ministerial function.

2. Because they do vow and undertake at their ordination, when they enter into holy orders, that they will give themselves wholly to that vocation.

3. Because councils and canons in several ages do forbid them to meddle with secular affairs.

4. Because the twenty-four bishops have a dependence on the two archbishops, and because of their canonical obedience to them.

5. Because they are but for life, and therefore are not fit to have legal power over the honours, inheritances, lives, and liberties of others.

6. Because of bishops' dependency and expectancy of translation to places of greater profit.

7. That several bishops have of late much encroached upon the consciences and liberties of the subject, and they and their successors will be much encouraged still to encroach, and the subject will be much discouraged from complaining against such encroachment, if twenty-six of that order be to be judges upon those complaints. The same reason extends to their legislative power in any bill to pass for the regulation of their power upon any emergent inconveniences by it.

8. Because the whole number of them is interested to maintain the jurisdiction of bishops, which hath been found so dangerous to the three kingdoms that Scotland hath utterly abolished it, and multitudes in England and Ireland have petitioned against it.

9. Because the bishops, being Lords of Parliament, it setteth too great a distance between them and the rest of their brethren in the ministry, which occasioneth pride in them, discontent in others, and disquiet in the church.

To their having votes a long time. *Answer:*

If inconvenient, time and usage are not to be considered lawmakers. Some abbots voted as anciently as bishops, yet they were taken away.

That for the bishops' certificate for plenary of benefice and loyalty of marriage the bill extends not to them.

For the secular jurisdiction of the Dean of Westminster, the Bishops of Durham and Ely, and the Archbishop of York, which they are to execute in their own persons, the former reasons show the inconveniences therein.

For their temporal courts and jurisdiction, which are executed by their temporal officers, the bill doth not concern them.

Now I unhesitatingly claim that in this paper is contained the unhampered, deliberate sense of the House, as representative of the unhampered, deliberate sense of contemporaries. The very composition of the committee which prepared these heads is scarcely to be understood on any other grounds—Pym, Hyde, Hollis, Culpeper, Hampden, Selden, Strode, Falkland, Fiennes, Strangeways, Walter, Sir Henry Vane, etc.

By this time the Root-and-branch Bill was in committee, but that bill has not this character. But for the pressure of incident (amongst others the rejection of this bill against bishops by the Lords), the Root-and-branch Bill would have remained the unaccomplished dream of a faction.

As it was still unconvinced by the arguments of the Commons, on the 8th of June the House of Lords finally rejected the bill on the third reading;[1] and here for the

[1] L. J., iv. 269.

nonce is an end to this bill, and here too—but not for a moment merely—was an end to all dreams of a moderate church reform.

As the main purpose of this Introduction is to describe the gradual growth and acceptance of the idea of an alteration in church government, it will not be necessary to allude any further to the general reforms on the subject of religious abuses—the bill against pluralities and non-residence, and against scandalous clergymen, and also against superstitious innovations, or the orders passed independently by the Commons (*e.g.*, in giving freedom to the maintenance of lecturers in parishes). On these subjects there existed no difference of opinion either within the Commons or between the Commons and Lords. In fact, the Upper House responded to the general efforts of the Commons by similar orders of their own. On the occasion of their trial of Dr. Pocklington they ordered all the images and superstitions set up by him as incumbent to be demolished, and strictly commanded the bishop of the diocese to see this done. This was followed by a general order, on the 1st of March, that every bishop in his particular diocese shall give directions and take care that "the communion table in every church in his diocese doth stand decently in the ancient place where it ought to do by law, and as it hath done for the greater part of these sixty years last past.[1]"

This has been regarded as a step in the direction of an ecclesiastical settlement; at the same time the order was

[1] L. J., iv. 174.

not free from an intentional ambiguity. But it rather seems to have another aspect: it was intended to enforce the placing of the tables according to the rubric of Elizabeth's first prayer-book, but that only as a temporary measure, until the House had taken more deliberate and decisive steps; for on the same day on which this order was made the Lords appointed a most influential committee to consider of all innovations in the church concerning religion. Five days later this committee was empowered to send for such learned men as they pleased to assist them.[1] This order was repeated on the 10th of March, and several names mentioned, "as the Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Dr. Prideaux, Dr. Ward, Dr. Twiste (Twisse), Dr. Hacket," who were to have intimation given to them by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln.[2]

On the occasion of the appointment of this committee Mr. Gardiner has extracted from the Wodrow *MSS.* (Edinburgh) some slight account of the debate.[3] "The Lord Saye spoke very freely against Episcopacy and the liturgy, constantly averring that he would never hear it. Bristol answered that there were some things indifferent pressed on men's consciences which must be taken away, but what was established by law no man might separate from it. Saye replied that they were now in *loco et tempore mutationis*, and therefore desired that a committee might be appointed for that effect."

Hacket has preserved some account of this committee.[4] Its constitution, apparently, subsequently changed; a

[1] L. J., iv. 177. [2] L. J., iv. 180. [3] Gardiner, ix. 298.
[4] *Scrinia Reserata*, part ii. p. 147.

section of the original number was joined with the divines to form a sub-committee. Over both forms of it Williams presided. The list of those divines who did constantly attend is thus given by Hacket: Bishop of Lincoln, Primate of Armagh, Bishop of Durham, Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Ward, Dr. Prideaux, Dr. Sanderson, Dr. Featley, Dr. Brownrigg, Dr. Houldsworth, Dr. Hacket, Dr. Twisse, Dr. Burgess, Mr. White, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Hill.

Williams summoned these divines to the assistance of the Lords' committee in the following important and ungrammatical letter:

I am commanded by the Lords of the committee for innovations in matters of religion that you know that their said Lordships have assigned and appointed you to attend them as assistant in that committee, and to let you know in general that the Lords do intend to examine all innovations in doctrine or discipline introduced into the Church without law since the Reformation, and if their Lordships shall find it behoveful for the good of the Church and State to examine after that the degrees and perfection of the Reformation itself, which I am directed to intimate to you, that you may prepare your thoughts, studies, and meditations accordingly, expecting their Lordships' pleasure for the particular points as they shall arise. March 12, 164$\frac{0}{1}$.

"This theological junto," says Hacket, "had six meetings in Westminster College, in all which time all passages of discourse were very friendly between part and part. The complainants noted the passages of some books that suited not, in their judgment, with the doctrine of our Church. They were condemned. Somewhat in cere-

mony and in outward form, as beside canon and supernumerary, they had their asking to bid it be restrained. Their exceptions against our liturgy were petty and stale — older than the old exchange — yet for their contentment the vote of the meeting did tend one way, to castigate some phrases, to publish the next printed books in all passages, from the beginning to the end, from the translation of King James's Bible, and to furnish the calendar altogether with passages of canonical scripture, expunging the apocryphal. The bishop had undertaken a draught for regulating the government ecclesiastical, but had not finished it. The sudden and quiet despatch of all that was done was attributed to the chairman's dexterity."

Baxter has preserved, in his autobiography, a paper which he ascribes to the time of this committee, and which we may with probability ascribe to the very occasion.[1]

A copy of the proceedings of some worthy and learned divines touching innovations in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, together with considerations on the Common Prayer Book.

I take it to be from the hand of Morton or Usher, or perhaps even more probably an agenda paper drawn up by Williams himself, or given to him by Calamy, or Marshall. Baxter calls them "concessions."

The paper consists of eighteen questions as to the errors of doctrine preached appertaining to Popish practice, or the gross substance of Arminianism. These are

[1] *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, part 2, p. 369.

followed by twenty-one questions on points of "discipline," which include the turning of the table altarwise and bowing, its candlesticks, canopies, the rails, the reading of the second service, prohibiting ministers from expounding the catechism, suppressing lectures, and prohibiting conceived prayer before sermon.

These are followed by three memoranda :

1. That in all Cathedral and Collegiate churches two sermons be preached every Sunday by the Dean and Prebendaries . . . and one lecture at the least to be preached on working days every week all the year round.

2. That the music used in God's holy service in Cathedral and Collegiate churches be framed with less curiosity.

3. That the reading desk be placed in the church where divine service may best be heard of all the people.

The paper closes with thirty-five exceptions to imperfections in the Prayer Book.

I need hardly point out how characteristic this paper is of the whole history of English Puritanism proper. This paper embodies in substance the demands of Puritanism in 1603 and 1660, free at both those times alike, as at this date, 1641, from any element of Presbyterianism proper.

Baxter has also preserved in his autobiography the scheme for the reduction of Episcopacy to the form of synodical government, which he himself attributes to Usher.[1]

This is the scheme that was oftenest quoted in connection with any idea of moderate reform or of comprehen-

[1] *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, part 2, p. 238–40.

sion, and was offered by the Puritan ministers at the Savoy Conference in 1661. It asserts that the [preaching] elders in common ruled the church, that the president obtained his honour by good report, and that betwixt the bishop and the presbytery there was a harmonious consent in the ordering of Church government (speaking of the Church of Ephesus). It therefore makes the following proposals for the restoration of this ancient form of government by the united suffrages of the clergy, and for the accordance of the synodical conventions of the pastors of every parish with the presidency of the bishops of every diocese and province: (1) rector, churchwardens, and sidesmen to be turned into a parochial presbytery; (2) rural deaneries to be the basis of a monthly synod; (3) the diocese to be the basis of a half-yearly synod; (4) the provinces to be the basis of a triennial national assembly.

But there is some uncertainty as to the authenticity of this scheme.

Williams also offered a scheme for reconciliation on this head of Church government.

The principal points of this scheme were heads three and four:

3. That every bishop shall have twelve assistants, besides the dean and chapter; four to be chosen by the King, four by the Lords, and four by the Commons, for assistance in the exercise of jurisdiction and ordination.

4. That in all vacancies these assistants, with the dean and chapter, shall present to the King three of the ablest divines in the diocese, who shall choose one to be bishop.

Usher's scheme (if authentic) is much better known and more drastic, displaying the effect of his intercourse with the Scottish churches in the North of Ireland.

This committee was entirely useless. Its meetings were interrupted or intermitted, not, as Hacket says, because its work was over in the first six meetings, but by the pressure of business and the course of events. On the 5th of April, the Lords ordered the committee to meet on the following Thursday, thus indicating an intermission of its sitting. They were determined to wait for the results of its proceedings; and the Bill "for the better regulating of archbishops and for the better governing of courts ecclesiastical," which was presented to the Lords on the 1st July, is to be regarded as the final form of the independent resolution of the Lords on this matter of Church reform. But it cannot be gathered from the Journals that this bill had been drawn up by Williams's Committee, or that there had even been a report made. It would seem likely that the committee fell through, and that the Lords introduced the bill on their own initiation, but doubtless following the lead of Bishop Williams. The text of this bill has been recently printed by Mr. Gardiner.[1] It is interesting as showing the full length to which the Lords were ready to go in matter of reform of Church and Church government. The bill was read a second time on the 3rd July, and debated in a Committee of the whole House on the 12th.[2] But no further mention of it occurs. The time for such a bill had gone by.

[1] *Const. Doc.*, pp. 94-106 [2] L. J., iv. 308.

Had it been proposed in November, 1640, it would doubtless have been considered a complete satisfaction on all points complained of, and the scheme of Church government there indicated is that to which the majority of opinions gravitated, and which might have become more than an opinion but for the outbreak of the war. But already by the middle of 1641 the growth of feeling had carried the question beyond the stage indicated by this bill of the Lords.

The fate of the bill against the bishops' votes in Parliament has already been noted. On the 24th May, 1641, the Lords rejected the main head of it. Three days later, on Thursday, May 27, the Root-and-branch Bill was introduced into the Commons. The introduction of this measure is to be regarded as immediately due to the rejection of the main head of the Bishops' Bill. It is incorrect to state that the bill was a threat or attempt at pressure on the Lords to pass the Bishops' Bill, as a little attention to dates will show. The first reading of the bill was moved by Sir Edward Dering, who, in a series of his own speeches, printed in the following year (1642), gives this account of the transaction :[1]

The bill for the abolition of our present Episcopacy was pressed into my hand by Sir A. H. [Haselrig], being then brought unto him by Sir H. V. [the younger Vane], and O. C. [Cromwell]. He told me he was resolved that it should go in, but he was earnestly urgent that I should present it.[2] The bill did hardly stay in my hands so long as to make a hasty perusal of it. Whilst I was overreading it Sir Edward

[1] *British Museum*, E. 197. [2] C. J., iii. 57.

Ainscough delivered in a petition out of Lincoln, which was seconded by Mr. Strode, in such a sort as that I had a fair invitement to issue forth the bill then in my hand, so I stood up.

The bill as presented by Dering was very short and intituled, "An act for the utter abolishing and taking away of all archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters, and canons, and all other their under officers."

As this speech of Dering's has been slightly misunderstood, it is necessary to quote from it:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who spoke last taking notice of the multitude of complaints and complainants against the present government of the Church, doth somewhat seem to wonder that we have no more pursuit ready against the persons offending. Sir, the time is present and the work is ready. . . . I am now the instrument to present to you a very sharp bill, such as these times and their very sad necessities have brought forth. . . . I give it you as I take physic, not for delight, but for a cure—a cure now the last and only cure, if, as I hope, all other remedies have first been tried. . . . I never was for ruin so long as I could hold any hope of reforming. . . . My hopes that way are now almost withered.

Sir, you see their demerits have exposed them *publici odii piaculares victimas.* I am sorry they are so ill; I am more sorry they will not be content to be bettered, *which I did hope would have been effected by our last bill.* When this bill is perfected I shall give a sad "aye" unto it, and at the delivery in thereof I do now profess beforehand that if my former hopes of a full reformation may yet revive and prosper, I will again divide my sense upon this bill, and yield my shoulders to underprop the ancient, lawful, and just Episcopacy yet so as that I will never

be wanting with my utmost pains and prayers to root out all the undue adjuncts to it and superstructions on it.

The success which attended the measure must have surprised its most sanguine supporters. It seems plain, from some expressions in D'Ewes' speech, that the bill was not at first regarded very seriously, and it is also plain, from the numbers on the division, that its numbers included more than the mere Rooters; that it included those Puritans who wished for a reformed primitive Episcopacy. "I moved," said D'Ewes,[1] "that I desired the bill might be read the second time, because I saw no inconveniency, *for it might rest as well after the second reading as after the first.* One thing was objected by the gentleman on the other side (Sir J. Culpeper) that he did not think the government of Episcopacy yet so past hope of reformation as we should yet need to enter upon this last and final remedy. I answer that the holding of their temporal employments be such a Diana to them as they will not part from, that there was little hope of other amendment, and for his desiring us to stay to see what the Lords would yet do with our bill lately sent up to them to debar bishops from all secular employments, and to take some time to debate the matter of Episcopacy and deans and chapters before we read the bill the second time, all this might be as well done after the second reading thereof, for it might be referred to a Committee of the whole House, and a fit time appointed when all these particulars might be fully debated."

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 625.

The bill was read a second time on the same day, the second reading being carried by 139–108.

After the second reading a debate arose on the question of commitment. Hyde stood up to defend his beloved church and that government "under which it had continued many hundred years in great happiness." Pleydall asserted that the bill aimed at the subversion of truth and peace, and wished it committed to the fire. In answering an objection made on this occasion by one of their speakers (doubtless Pleydall), and which had certainly been often enough made on other occasions, D'Ewes uses words which show us what has been already gathered from the debates in February, and is confirmed by the history of the Root-and-branch Bill itself, that the House had not conceived any practicable scheme of Church government that might replace Episcopacy. The House shunned the question, and it was this disposition that led it to the adoption of the idea of a synod of divines. "Nor shall we need," said D'Ewes, "to study long for a new Church government, having so evident a platform in so many reformed churches."

Hollis, Pym, and Cage spoke directly against the government of the Church by bishops, and it was not until after a long and frequently renewed debate that it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the whole House. Even then a fresh and hot dispute arose as to when the debate should take place—the defenders of Episcopacy desiring it to be postponed till after the disbanding of the two armies. The ruse was too appa-

rent and signally futile; the debate was ordered for the following Thursday, June 3rd. It was not, however, held on the 3rd. It was moved for on the 7th, but did not actually commence till Friday 11th June. At this point D'Ewes *Diary* gives us an insight into the secret management of this memorable Parliament :[1]

Sir Robert Harley, as I gathered, Mr. Pym, Mr. Hampden, and others, with Mr. Stephen Marshall, parson of Finchingfield in Essex, and some others, had met yesternight, and appointed that this bill should be proceeded withal this morning, and the said Sir Robert Harley moved it first in this House. For Mr. Hampden, out of his serpentine subtlety, did still put others to move those business that he contrived.

D'Ewes again refers to this in another, the most picturesque, passage of his whole diary, which I cannot refrain from quoting :[2]

Conceiving that the great business of the Bishops' Bill would not have been brought into the House till Monday next ensuing, June 14, I went out of the House in the forenoon, after I had sitten there awhile, to walk in Westminster Hall behind the shops near the Court of Common Pleas; when Mr. Stephen Marshall, minister of Finchingfield, came to me and asked me how chance I was not in the House; and desired me to make haste thither, because they were in agitation about this great business for abolishing bishops. I told him I thought it was not possible, because I was but a little before come out of the House. He answered me that it was undoubtedly so, and that some of the House had determined to call for it to-day. I then asked him why I had no notice of this as well as others. He told me they were sure of me. I said aye if you expect only my aye or

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 692. [2] D'Ewes, iii. 1014.

no; but if you expect of me that I should speak in the cause you should in civility have given me notice. So I hasted to my chamber near the hall to peruse anew those fragmentary notes which follow, . . . but before I could peruse them half over, Mr. John Moore, a member of the House, came to my lodging to call me away, because the Bishops' Bill was in agitation, which shows the hollow-heartedness of Mr. Pym, Mr. Hampden, and those other seeming wise men, who, though they relied upon me to speak, yet they concealed their intendment from me, that I might do below myself in speaking.

When D'Ewes entered the House, Pleydall was speaking against the bill, and reading Latin quotations from the fathers. In spite of his "unprepared state," D'Ewes spoke in reply at great length. His speech consists of his usual long-winded account of the unpatriotic action of bishops in early English history, and would not be worthy of remark were it not for the temper it displays towards the close. There was no flinching in D'Ewes' advocacy of a new order of things. "All grievances and inconveniences which may at first happen in a new government will be remedied by frequent Parliaments, and for the distractions which may happen in the meantime, before a new Church discipline be settled, it may fully be provided for by a Bill or Act of twenty lines, in which I would have a clause inserted for the severe punishing of tradesmen and other ignorant persons who shall presume to preach."[1] Fiennes and Clotworthy

[1] D'Ewes, iii. 1015. In Nalson, ii. 298, there is a speech of Rudyard's which belongs to this date. Nalson wrongly assigns it to the 21st.

spoke generally to the bill; then it was taken piecemeal, and the preamble was read and debated. The preamble was finally voted in this form: "Whereas the government of the Church of England by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, and commissaries, deans, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers, hath been found by long experience to be a great impediment to the perfect reformation and growth of religion, and very prejudicial to the civil state and government of this kingdom."

As was inevitable from the situation, such a preamble could not be rejected. It could not indeed be opposed. Even Culpeper confessed that of late years many calamities had happened by them in the Church, but he weakly desired that the words "long experience" and "government" might be changed to "late experience" and "governors," as he was not aware that it had been characteristic of Episcopacy in former times.

From the nature of the case this was the only argument open to defenders of Episcopacy. Although Culpeper received a crushing reply at the hands of St. John, the argument was iterated and reiterated.

John Crew, of Northampton, "a man of a very exact strict life" (and the fact moved D'Ewes to astonishment), desired rather a bill to restrain the bishop's power. John Coke declared that by the same argument monarchy might be taken away. The debate was long and evidently fierce, for Hyde received, as chairman of the committee, a sharp rebuke from Fiennes for allowing Coke's words to pass; but late at night (and the debate had begun at seven

in the morning) the preamble was passed, reported to the House, and adopted.

On the following day the point for debate was the abolition of the offices of archbishop, bishops, etc.

It is indicative of the small difference in matter of political tenets, and of the huge difference in sentiment, that the debate proceeded as hotly as ever before, and yet revealed very little fresh matter.

As on the previous day, Culpeper was driven by his own knowledge of matter of fact, by his own previous utterances, to acknowledge some measure of justice in the preamble. His only resource was to question the necessity of taking the most fatal and final course. "Agreeing first to the preamble, he said though they were in their persons an impediment, yet this should not make us to take them away; and, secondly, that before we abolish the government, we should offer a new."[1] Falkland's objection was on a plane of sentiment low and unworthy of him. Pleydall could only sigh for the condition of religion, and weakly declare that if religion would return to its primitive purity we should return to it.

But circumstances were gradually making the maintenance of such an attitude impossible. *Pari passu* with the change that was taking place in the Moderates, who were for reform, the course of events was adding to the acerbity and to the clearness of view and constructive ability of their opponents, and was simultaneously driving Falkland and the Episcopal party (let us *now* adopt the

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 694.

term) from a position in which their opinions clashed with their sentiment into one of mere antagonism to a party now at last bent on reform. The rejection of the Bishops' Bill had been a matter of satisfaction to the Root-and-branch party. Sharper measures, they thought, were now at hand, and D'Ewes, though far from a professed Rooter, did but reflect this feeling in his speech. "I acknowledge it a great providence that the Lords refused to pass our other bill. Truly I think God gave no blessing to it, because we did our work by halves; but now when we shall do the work thoroughly, we shall have no cause to despair of a good result." To Culpeper's demand for a platform D'Ewes could give no reply. "It hath been objected that before we alter the old government of the church we should establish a new one. For that it may be answered that before a new house be builded where an old one stood, the old one must first be removed."[1]

Husband's *Passages and Speeches of this Parliament* contains a speech of Sir Henry Vane. As printed it is assigned to the 11th, but doubtless it belongs to this debate of the 12th, and was uttered by the younger Vane.[2]

It is of interest as exhibiting the opinions of the man who was apparently the originator of the bill, and who certainly was the promoter of the scheme which was afterwards introduced into the bill. "For my part," said he, "I am of the opinion of those who conceive that the

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 694.

[2] Dr. Nalson prints it, and ascribes it to the elder Vane.

strength of reason already set down in the preamble to this bill by yesterday's vote is a necessary decision of this question. For one of the main ends for which Church government is set up is to advance and further the perfect Reformation and growth of religion which we have already voted this government doth contradict. . . . In the second place, we have voted it prejudicial to the civil state. . . . But to this it hath been said that the government now in question may be so reformed and amended that it needs not be pulled down quite, because it is conceived it hath no original sin or evil in it, or, if it had, it is said regeneration will take it away; unto which I answer I do consent that we should do with this government as we are done by in regeneration, in which old things are to pass away and all things are to become new, and this we must do if we desire a perfect reformation, and growth of our religion, or good to our civil state, for the whole fabric of the building is so rotten and corrupt from the very foundation of it to the top that if we pull it not down now it will fall about the ears of all those that endeavour it within a very few years."

He then passes in review the evils of the existing system, its affinity in character and derivation with Popery, its pride, encouragement of superstition and persecution of godly ministers, and its threatening attitude to the civil state, and concludes in a manner worthy of Cromwell himself. "Lastly, and that which I assure you goes nearest to my heart, is the check which we seem to give to Divine Providence if we do not at this time pull down this government. For hath not this Parliament

been called, continued, preserved, and secured by the immediate finger of God, as it were, for this work? Had we not else been swallowed up in many inevitable dangers by the practices and designs of these men and their party? Hath not God left them to themselves as well in these things [army plots, etc.] as in the evil administration of their government that he might lay them open unto us, and lead us, as it were, by the hand from the finding them to be the causes of our evil to discern that their rooting up must be our only cure?"

On Hyde's report from the Committee, the House resolved that the taking away of the several offices of archbishops, bishops, chancellors, and commissaries out of the Church and kingdom shall be one clause of the bill.

Although the debate had lasted seven hours, and it was nearly four o'clock when Hyde made the report, some in their eagerness to go on with the work called out to proceed with the bill after the vote had passed.[1]

The debate was, however, adjourned until the following Tuesday, when the House took up the consideration of deans and chapters, "and the rest of the rabble depending on them."

D'Ewes seemed to think the treatment of this subject to be his peculiar and sole heritage. As on a former occasion, he was among the first to speak; and, however the House disrelished his long-winded discourses (though there is no inkling of such a fact in his egotistical *Journal*), it certainly owed him thanks, for his

[1] D'Ewes, iii. 1025.

fearless opposition to the clerical claim of inviolability for the revenues of deans and chapters. In his opinion these were but the revenues left formerly for superstitious purposes to abbeys, etc. "Both the doctors," said he, referring to the previous occasion on which Hacket and Burgess had been heard at the bar, "did agree in the end that neither king nor public should partake of the Church revenue, but that it was sacrilege to take it away To this I hope to give a clear and full answer." Whether his answer was satisfactory to contemporaries or not we cannot judge, for we to-day cannot appreciate the strength of the religious feeling of that age. To us the whole question seems superfluous. But it would probably strike a certain section of the House, when he called upon the holders of impropriations to disgorge their possessions. As, however, has been noticed already, there were two sides to the judgment of the House. That House had evidently made up its mind against deans and chapters; it recorded its decision on this day. Yet it required some satisfaction on the point of legal right and justification, and, therefore, listened gratefully to such speakers as D'Ewes and Thomas, the latter of whom entered into a long disquisition on the nature of the functions of deans in the time of Augustine, and thence traced their history to his own time.[1]

But it is evident that if no satisfaction of the kind had been given, the vote would have been the same. D'Ewes

[1] Thomas's speech is given in Rushworth, iv. 283, and Nalson, ii. 283. The latter wrongly dates it June 11th.

was followed by Glyn. Falkland, as might be expected, spake in favour of the institution. Fiennes, Sir Thomas Widrington, and Peard as obstinately maintained the opposite. But the most surprising feature in the debate is Culpeper's speech as recorded in D'Ewes.[1] It plainly indicates how little heart the Episcopal party had in their cause, and how purely their position was a matter of sentiment.

"For deans and chapters, he thought them so to depend on the bishops, as the bishops being taken away the others must necessarily be abolished; . . . . but he desired that provision might be made for the maintenance of those during their lives that we should put out, and for the disposition of those revenues for the time to come that learning and piety might be thereby advanced."

In the afternoon the opposition to this head of the bill assumed a different aspect, though one equally futile, at the hands of Selden. In his opinion deans and chapters, not being a part of the government of the bishops, could not be included in the bill—therefore their abolition was a *non sequitur*.[2]

The point was a puerile one for such a man to urge, and was easily answered by St. John and Pury.

The speech of the latter of these is very noticeable.

Pury was an alderman of Gloucester, and, to meet Culpeper's scruples on the score of the ejected members, he laid down a scheme for the employment of the revenues of the dean and chapter of Gloucester.[3] It is

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 706. [2] D'Ewes, ii. 707.
[3] Rushworth, iv. 288; Nalson, ii. 289.

noticeable as showing that though his vote on this occasion was evidently engaged for the bill, he is not to be reckoned among the veritable Rooters. After sketching a provision for the existing members of the system thus: "If the dean and those prebends, being but seven in all to be now taken away, will be preaching ministers, there is a sufficient maintenance for so many of them as have not too much besides, and yet to reserve as large a salary as now is allowed for so many singing men then in holy orders as cannot preach, etc., etc.," his scheme concludes: "Out of the manors and lands, the said cathedral living to be made a parochial church, £200 or more may be allowed for a learned preaching minister there, and £100 per annum each for two such others to assist him; and then the rest of the said manors and lands may be employed to other godly, pious, and charitable uses as the wisdom of the King and Parliament shall think fit."

On Hyde's report, the House resolved: "That all deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters, canons and petty canons, and their officers, shall be utterly abolished and taken away out of the church; and, secondly, that all the lands taken by this bill from deans and chapters shall be employed for the advancement of learning and piety, provision being had and made that his Majesty be no loser in his rents, first-fruits, and other duties, and a competent maintenance shall be made to the several persons concerned, if such persons appear not peccant and delinquent to the house."

Owing to the pressure of business, the bill was not proceeded with again till Monday, 21st June.

The clause of the bill discussed on this day was that which provided for the abolition of the ecclesiastical courts, and the enacting of a præmunire against such as should hereafter fall into error.

The discussion was certainly the most momentous of all the ecclesiastical debates of the early years of the Long Parliament, and strikingly exhibits the salient characteristics of the House. Even Hyde, the most blindly thorough-going of the Episcopal party, had a grudge against this element of the ecclesiastical system. "Mr. Hide himself said that if they meddled with probate of wills or matrimony they should incur a præmunire." There cannot be detected in D'Ewes account of this debate any trace of dissent or division of opinion as to this liability to a præmunire. Some members of the House supposed that this clause of the bill would affect the bishops' votes in Parliament, but, upon explanation given that the clause only concerned proceedings in ecclesiastical courts by and under the power of archbishops, bishops, deans, etc., exercised by their commissaries and officials, and did not at all touch upon any act performed by the bishops in their own persons or to their votes in Parliament, no other dispute was made save as to the date from which the præmunire should be incurred.[1] The date fixed was the 1st August. It is very evident, from the nature of a verbal addition made

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 723.

after the fixing of this date, that the course of the debate was being very carefully and skilfully managed. A qualifying clause was inserted in these words (whoso shall exercise jurisdiction) "otherwise or in any other manner than shall be provided and allowed in the present act." This clause, together with the last clause of the bill in its original form (viz., "and be it further enacted by authority aforesaid that all ecclesiastical jurisdiction fit to be exercised within this Church and kingdom of England shall be committed to such a number of persons and in such a manner as by this present act (shall be) appointed")[1] was meant to prepare the way for Vane's scheme, which was handed in almost immediately thereupon. For no sooner had Dering got up to urge the House, having regard to the chances of the bill in the Lords, to make some provision for the juridical government of the Church, and had offered to show the way by proposing certain provisions, than he was rudely and sharply interrupted, and before he could find opportunity to conclude his speech, the younger Vane had handed in a clause which in reality contained a new scheme for the Church jurisdictional government. The clause provided for the appointment of a body of commissioners, lay and clerical, to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in every shire for a time. As soon as Dering had recovered from his surprise, he hastened to conclude his speech and to offer his alternative scheme.[2] This scheme of Dering's is worthy of attention. It contains three

[1] Nalson, ii. 300. [2] Rushworth, iv. 293; Nalson, ii. 295.

points: (1) The circuit for future Church government, or the diocese should be the shire; (2) in each of these, twelve or more chosen, able, grave divines to be appointed by Parliament to be of the nature of an old primitive constant presbytery; (3) over each of these a president, "let him be a bishop, or an overseer, or a president, or a moderator, or a superintendent, or a ruling elder, call him what you will."

Here was the reduction and restoration of the pure primitive Episcopal presidency.

Many in the House seem to have adopted Dering's scheme, though there was a difference of opinion whether the president of the presbytery should be constant or only temporary and elective, and so at the will of the Presbytery.[1] This is the first division of opinion discoverable in the action of the now triumphant majority of the Commons, and the day did not close with a final vote, as had the debates on the 12th and 15th, but a sub-committee was named, and the three clauses of the bill already passed, with the addition brought in by Vane, were referred to its consideration.

While the bill lay before this sub-committee, the Lords had taken action in the matter. The Upper House was not deficient in its regard for the importance of the subject of religion, and already voices had been heard deploring the differences between the two bodies in this matter. Nalson has preserved a paper which he describes as presented to the House of Commons.[2] It is doubtless

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 723. [2] Nalson, ii. 301.

a paper intended to be presented to the Lords, or notes of a speech to be made by one of the Puritan Lords, Bedford or Saye, or perhaps by Williams himself. "It is a doubtful case, in the heat of this dispute, how far the Commons may go in the declaration of their opinion, in which, if the Lords shall not concur, it may prove a great rock of offence between the two Houses. Therefore 'tis very requisite that the Lords of the Upper House do timely interest themselves in the discussion. To this purpose the Lords may be pleased to make a Committee in their House for the reformation of Church affairs and government, and thereupon demand a conference with the Committee of the House of Commons that the business may be handled by a consultation on both sides." The fear expressed in this paper must have been before the eyes of many in the Upper House, and it was doubtless the result of this desire for a compromise when the Lords took action in this matter of Church government.

On Thursday, 1st July, a bill was introduced into the Upper House "for the regulating of archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, canons, prebends, and the better ordering of their revenues, and for the better governing of the courts ecclesiastical and the ministers thereof, and the proceedings therein." The bill was read a second time on Saturday, 3rd July, but no further trace appears of it, and by the close of the session a breach had declared itself between the two Houses on the subject of an order against superstitious innovations. For the present the Commons were to be left to legislate alone.

On Thursday, 8th July, Prideaux reported from the

sub-committee to the grand committee certain amendments and considerations on the Root-and-branch Bill.

The nature of the action of this sub-committee is apparent from the notes of the report (for such I take them to be) preserved in the *Verney Notes* (Camden Society, p. 104). They evidently are in the form of recommendations, thus :

The dean and chapter's lands put to feoffees to satisfy the King's dues, and

The feoffees to pay it to the persons now in possession. . . Commissions to certify what lands the bishops, deans and chapters now have, and what is paid out of those lands, and also to certify what Church livings are under £100 per annum, and also about chapels of ease.

Jurisdiction.—Two Commissions for Canterbury and York for Archiepiscopal government, and nine or five commissioners in every county to exercise Episcopal government. All writs to be directed to the Commissioners ; all ecclesiastieal courts devolved to them, and to meet monthly.

Ordination.—These commissioners give warrant to five commissioners to ordain any man into holy orders. (The) commissioners shall call three divines to punish heresy, schism, etc., according to ecclesiastical laws. For non-payment of fees he shall be as an excommunicate person, only he may come to church.

Relatively to the importance of it, this report (if such it is) met with little discussion. It was, in substance, adopted on the following day, after a futile reiteration from Culpeper of the objections, on the ground of conscience, to the giving of the bishops' lands to the King.[1]

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 772.

On Friday, 9th July, it was adopted *in toto*, as to the matter of the first point, in the following resolutions :

1. All lands, possessions, and rights of all deans and deans and chapters shall by this bill be committed to the hands of feoffees to be nominated in this bill.

2. That all the lands and possessions of all the archbishoprics and bishoprics of England and Wales, except the impropriations and advowsons, shall by this act be given to the King.

3. That all impropriations and advowsons belonging to the archbishoprics and bishoprics of England and Wales shall be committed into the hands of feoffees in the same manner as the lands of deans and chapters are appointed to be.[1]

On the following day, 10th July (Saturday), the House supplemented these resolutions by another making provision for the employment of the revenues : "A competent maintenance shall be allowed out of the lands and possessions of the cathedral churches for the support of a fit number of preaching ministers for the service of every such church, and a proportionable allowance for the reparation of the said churches."[2]

Passing next, on Monday, 12th July,[3] to the second head of the report—jurisdiction— the House resolved that "such ecclesiastical power as shall be exercised for the government of the Church shall be transferred by this act into the hands of commissioners to be named in this act; secondly, that the commissioners, or the major part of them, named in this act shall have authority to

[1] C. J., ii. 204. [2] C. J., ii. 205.

[3] I here follow D'Ewes, ii. 777, rather than the C. J., ii. 205, the latter of which dates the resolution the 10th.

appoint deputies and other officers to exercise the jurisdiction given to them by this act."

It has been generally noticed that in the former of these two resolutions there was an alteration in the policy of the House. In the proviso of Vane, which first moved this matter on the 20th June, the scheme had proposed commissioners drawn equally from the clergy and the laity. By this vote of the 12th July all the commissioners were to be laymen. It is easy to understand how the general sense of the House went this way. "Divers," says D'Ewes, "spake touching the committing of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction to lay commissioners. Mr. Selden spake exceeding well to it, and showed that the said jurisdiction might be exercised by laymen."[1]

The constitution of this commission was further discussed on the 15th and subsequent days.

It would seem, from D'Ewes,[2] that the House, following out Prideaux's suggestions as reported from the subcommittee, determined on the establishment of two committees—the one as succeeding to the Archiepiscopal jurisdiction, the other to the Episcopal. The whole scheme was, therefore, something like this :—The whole jurisdiction was to be in the hands of the chief commissioners (subsequently fixed at nine in number). These had power to delegate their functions, and by themselves and their delegates ecclesiastical justice was to be

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 177.

[2] As the House was in Committee, or through inadvertency, the resolutions of these days are not entered in the Common's Journals. They are preserved for us in D'Ewes, ii. 786.

administered in the several counties by county commissions (as inheriting Episcopal jurisdiction), and generally over the two provinces by two provincial commissions (as inheriting Archiepiscopal jurisdiction).

It was decided on the 17th that appeal should lie to the latter from the former.[1]

Such I take to be the meaning of the resolutions passed on the 15th and subsequent days of July.

Those of the 15th were in these words: (1) "The commissioners appointed by this act for the several provinces of Canterbury and York shall respectively exercise archiepiscopal jurisdiction within the said several provinces; (2) All the ecclesiastical jurisdiction committed by this act to the commissioners, except the archiepiscopal, shall be exercised by these commissioners in every county of England except York and Lincoln, where they are to be appointed in the parts and ridings thereof."

A similar order was made for Wales.

When the House came next in order to consider of the constitution of a body for the purposes of ordination, much more division of opinion was displayed than on the matter of jurisdiction. A motion was made to constitute five ministers in every county for the purposes of ordination, and this was the form in which the final motion passed. But it was strongly objected to by some lovers of the primitive presbytery. To their minds the right of ordination was inherent in every presbyter, and it seemed as illogical to constitute five men for the purpose as to allow the bishop to do it alone.

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 790.

And it is probable that much division of opinion would have been displayed upon this head if it had not been pointed out, what was perhaps present as a menace to the minds of most, that a large body of the clergy at that moment was Episcopal in tendencies and scandalous in life, and therefore unfit for the function of ordination.

As finally resolved, the nomination of these five commissioners in each county was vested in the body of nine chief commissioners.

From the point of view of my narrative, these heads of jurisdiction and ordination are by far the most important elements in the Root-and-branch scheme. The object of this Introduction is to describe how the Parliament came to evolve a scheme of church government, and to show what that scheme was, and how different from the Presbyterian system which was adopted four years later as a consequence of the alliance with Scotland.

The idea that the body of clergymen and other ecclesiastical persons forming "the Church" needed a distinct organisation and government of their own, was to the English mind of the seventeenth century as commonplace and self-evident as that a Parliamentary and legal system were needed for the laity. Hitherto this ecclesiastical body had been governed in the diocese by the bishop and his court, in all matters relating to ordination, institution, trial for offence, and suspension. The Parliament had now declared against this Episcopal system, and it was necessary to replace it by some other. Apart from the abortive schemes for a "modified" Episcopacy, there were apparently only two plans feasible—(1) a system of

government by clerical assemblies, a Presbyterian system more or less after the Scottish model—all these matters of ordination, trial and censure being determined by vote in the local assembly or classis, and appeals lying to the higher ranges of the organisation, the provincial and national assemblies; (2) the alternative would be some such scheme as is contained in the resolutions of the Commons just described—by which the jurisdiction of the bishop's court was vested in the hands of a body of lay commissioners, who were to go on circuit in the spiritual courts, while the matter of ordination was referred in a similar way to a lay commission, all in actual dependence upon Parliament.

Had the course of events been different—had the English Parliament been left free to settle this question as its own instinct dictated, there can be no doubt that it is the latter scheme and not the former that would have been adopted. Such is the natural conclusion to be drawn from this account of the ecclesiastical debates of the Long Parliament. It was only gradually that the House came to resolve on the abolition of Episcopacy, and that it faced the question of the discovery of a church system to replace it; but throughout this course of mental evolution the Parliament was thoroughly true to the national instinct, and would have remained so had it not been that the course of the war made it necessary to accept Scotch aid at the price of the adoption of the Scottish church system.

The remaining point for discussion was concerning the disposition and use of the revenues of deans and chapters.

This was agitated on the 27th July, but for obvious reasons the matter had to be left in abeyance. In answer to Culpeper, D'Ewes urged that the House had, as a matter of fact, yet "first to know what are the revenues of the cathedrals, and what poor livings there are that ought to have a maintenance." This would, in the ordinary course of things, be the work of a Commission during the recess, upon the result of whose investigations the House might, at the next meeting, make a full disposition of the revenues. Accordingly the clause was left generally and vaguely worded, ordering merely the employment of the surplus for the advancement of the true religion, piety, and learning.[1]

Further than this the debates on the Root-and-branch Bill did not go during this session. The bill rested in Committee. The fright occasioned by Charles's journey to Scotland drove the matter into the background. One solitary attempt was made to revive the bill. As late as the 13th August, 1641 the Commons determined to proceed with the discussion on the following Monday. But the order was not followed out, and no other attempt was made. Although, like many another of the early attempts at legislation on this subject, the bill was fruitless, it is not, therefore, to be disregarded. It stands as an illustration of the advance of opinion that had been made since November, under the force of circumstances which compelled the House to examine its own mind, to know what it desired, and then to

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 798.

determine to have what it wanted. And, at the same time, it supplies us with a complete programme of purely Anglican Puritanism—lay and clerical alike. It shows what would probably have been the action taken, the church system and government adopted, now that the House had been roused to settle the matter definitively if events had not necessitated the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant. And, from this point of view, it is a true representation of the feelings of English Puritanism before the latter had come into contact with Scottish Presbyterianism. For I do not take it that this bill in its final shape, and all through the later debates on it, was the result of the action of a Root-and-branch party. The latter name is itself in reality misleading.

To one who is only beginning the study of this subject, it will probably appear that there were three parties or factions in the House (1) Episcopal, (2) Presbyterian, (3) Root-and-branch, and that this last is synonymous with Independents.

Whatever justification for this view there may be in the language of all histories from that day to this, no more gross mistake could be made. There were no factions in the House in all the time we are treating of; there were no parties, there were only shades of opinion. Some wished for a moderate reform of the church system,—let them be called Episcopalians; some wished for a more vigorous and particular reform in the shape of a reduction of the primitive Episcopacy or Presbytery,—let them *never* be called Presbyterians;

others wished for the same, but pressed for it with more abruptness, let them be called Root-and-branch men if it seems convenient. But they were not Independents. The difference was in degree, and not in kind, and all three opinions shaded into each other by imperceptible gradations.

Early in the session the majority of the body would have concentrated round a moderate scheme of reform; later the centre of gravity shifted, and the majority supported a more drastic measure, but in each case the majority was composed not of a faction or a conjunction of factions, but of the vacillating body of Moderates in the House. It was only the dire progress of events that led to the delimitation and hardening of those mere phases and grades of opinions into dogmas, and factions, and parties. This Root-and-branch Bill was now, in July, as much the general mind of the House as the votes on the canons had been in the December preceding. Otherwise how could such steady progress have been recorded with the measure?

The noticeable feature in these debates, and in the scheme elaborated in them, is the absence of any Presbyterian element. It is at first sight, perhaps, hard to realise the meaning and the truth of this. Almost every speaker of importance had expressed a veneration for the character of a primitive bishop, had claimed for every minister his share in the work of church government by the restoration of the ancient primitive Presbytery. But there is the greatest possible difference between this and an advocacy of the Presbyterian system as it was understood

in the seventeenth century. *Then*, Presbyterianism was a clerical system, encroaching largely upon the civil and national life. It judged the actions and morals of individuals; it haughtily arrogated to itself a share in the national government. There was nothing further from the mind of the English Parliament and nation than to favour such a scheme. What they desired was some practicable plan for the ruling and ordering of an unwieldy institution in order to make it more patriotic and evangelical, and the scheme evolved during these debates on the Root-and-branch Bill was peculiarly secular, indeed, astonishingly so when we bear in mind the respect the age had for the clerical function.

But a Presbyterian system as such had not entered the mind of the Parliament. This conclusion is intended to be the result of the whole of this Introductory survey, but I cannot refrain from further referring to two striking exemplifications of it. Later in the year (November 20, 1641), in the debates on the clauses of the grand Remonstrance which concerned religion, Dering had occasion to speak of Presbyterianism. His words are these: "Mr. Speaker, there is a certain newborn, unseen, ignorant, dangerous, desperate way of Independency. Are we for this Independent way? Nay, sir. Are we for the elder brother of it, the Presbyterial form? *I have not yet heard any one gentleman within these walls stand up and assert his thoughts for either of those ways.*"[1]

[1] British Museum, E 197, p. 100.

Baillie, in his remarkably interesting letters, often expresses his belief that the triumph of Presbytery was at hand, etc. There is not the slightest doubt that in his ignorance of the English constitution and character, and in his own too sanguine eagerness, he made a great mistake. This will be illustrated in another connection.

The question naturally offers itself: how did it happen that the Commons deserted the platform they occupied in the debates on the Root-and-branch Bill, and came finally to adopt a Scotch Presbyterian system? It was due simply to the progress and necessity of the war. Of its own free will the House did not again debate the question of church government. As the quarrel grew to a war, and the war grew grim, everybody knew that Episcopacy was doomed if the Parliamentary cause should triumph. Until victory began to declare itself, there was no need to revert to the question. Had the Parliament been able to win the victory without the Scotch aid, the question would have been reverted to, in all probability, in the sense of these debates of June, 1641, on Root-and-branch. A scheme of government and discipline would have been evolved by the advice of an assembly of divines, but that scheme would not have been Scotch Presbyterianism, though it would have resembled it in many features. But the progress of events did not allow of such a natural process of evolution.

On the 14th February $164\frac{1}{2}$, the King passed the bill for taking away bishop's votes in Parliament by a Commission. He accompanied the favour with a message which displays all the vacillation in Charles's character:

"His Majesty observes great and different troubles to arise in the hearts of his people concerning the government and liturgy of the church. His Majesty is willing to declare that he will refer the whole consideration to the wisdom of Parliament—which he desires them to enter into speedily, that the present distraction about the same may be composed—but desires not to be pressed to any single act on his part till the whole be so digested and settled by both Houses that his Majesty may clearly see what is fit to be left, as well as what is fit to be taken away."

If this message was not intended as an apple of discord, to any one who bears in mind the *non-possumus* attitude on this question assumed by Charles in the subsequent treaties of Uxbridge and Newport, these words are incomprehensible.

But, in truth, there was no need for immediate fear on the point. Not the slightest trace is discoverable of a wish on the part of the House to again revive that scheme of government which had been evolved in the Committee on the Root-and-branch Bill. The House was sanguine as to the chances of the Bishops' Bill, and, as regards the other points of church government and doctrine, the opinion was gaining ground that the breach with the King was becoming irreparable, and that the work would have to be done thoroughly when the course of events would permit, and that for such a work the assembly of divines was essential.

The Solemn League and Covenant was the determining factor in the final revolution of opinion which was ultimately forced upon the Long Parliament. From the first the influence of Scotland had tended in this direction. At the opening of Parliament, England and Scotland were nominally at war. Negotiations for peace had been begun at Ripon, which were shifted to York, and finally, in November, 1640, to London. While there the Scotch Commissioners did not confine themselves to the mere work of negotiation. They intrigued actively to fan the feeling against Episcopacy. The Scottish Commissioners were accompanied by four ministers—Alexander Henderson, Robert Blair, "to satisfy the minds of many in England who love the way of New England better than that of Presbyteries used in our Church [of Scotland];" Robert Baillie, "for the convincing of that prevalent faction against which I have written [Canterburians];" and Gillespie, "for the crying down of the English ceremonies for which he has written; and all four to preach by turns to our commissioners in their houses." (Baillie's *Letters*, i. 269.)

They arrived in London on the 15th November, and, if Baillie's words are an index of the thoughts of the Commissioners generally, they must have imagined that there was a Presbyterian faction ready to welcome them. The erroneousness of such an assumption has been already pointed out, but it would seem that the Commissioners for some time proceeded with the negotiations under that impression. "Think not," says Baillie, "we live any of us here to be idle. Mr. Henderson has ready

now a short treatise, much called for, of our church discipline. Mr. Gillespie has the grounds of Presbyterial government well asserted; Mr. Blair a pertinent answer to Hall's Remonstrance." On the occasion of Charles's declaration at Whitehall of the 23rd January, 164$\frac{2}{1}$, that he would consent to no change in the estate of bishops, the Scots put into print "Mr. Alexander Henderson's very good reasons for their removall out of the Church."

The method of the treaty was to take one demand at a time, the Scots refusing to reveal the whole of their demands beforehand. In consequence, the eighth demand, which contained as its third head the demand of the Scots on the point of church government, was not reached till the middle of February, 164$\frac{2}{1}$. In the uncertainty of the times preceding the condemnation of Strafford, both parties were reluctant to approach the question of uniformity of church government, but the unwelcome point was suddenly brought to the front by an act of imprudence—the publication by Henderson of "that little quick paper proclaiming the constancy of our zeal against Episcopacy." This was printed surreptitiously, and gave great offence. "Divers of our true friends did think us too rash, and, though they loved not the bishops, yet for the honour of their nation they would keep them up rather than that we strangers should pull them down." The result is told by Baillie thus: "We gave in a mollifying explanation of our meaning. Here we were put in a new pickle: the English peers were minded to have cause printed our explanation. This, doubtless, this rash and ignorant people would have taken for a recantation of what we

had printed before. But, in the end of that explanation, we had professed that we had yet more to say to the Parliament according to our instructions against Episcopacy, so before we had said all out, the King thought meet neither to publish his proclamation nor our explanation. Evil will had we to say out all our mind about Episcopacy till the English were ready to join with us in that greatest of questions, but there was no remedy. Good Mr. Alexander, being somewhat grieved with the event of the former writing, set himself with the more diligence to the accurate framing of the next, and, after some days delay, gave out that most diligent expression of our desires of unity in the ecclesiastic government in all the King's dominions, which here I send you."[1]

The English Commissioners replied by desiring the Scots not to move the Parliament in that matter, and, after many passionate words from the Earl of Bristol, the Scots consented to lay it aside till after the conclusion of Strafford's trial. The complete demands under this head were received by the Lords' Commissioners on the 10th April, and on the 14th May were discussed by the Upper House. The first demand concerned uniformity of religion and conformity of church government as a special means of preserving peace between the two kingdoms. But it was accompanied by an assurance from Bristol that the same morning "some of the principal lords of the Scots' Commissioners told the Lords' Commissioners that they could

[1] *Letters*, I., 306-7.

do no less but deliver in those papers, as they were commanded to do by those that employed them in this service, but yet told the Lords' Commissioners that what answer it shall please both Houses of Parliament to return in their own time, they will abide and acquiesce with that.[1]" The various papers which had passed between the Commissioners were read at the same time.

These data were communicated to the Commons at a conference on the following day, and they were debated in the Lords on the 20th April,[2] but the subject was not noticed in the Commons till the 15th and 17th May. On that occasion Hyde moved simply to adhere to the answers of the Commissioners, but D'Ewes, afraid of offending "so friendly and so potent a nation," moved "rather the question of the affection of the Scots, yea though we never intended to pursue any part of what they desire."[3] The resolution finally adopted was as follows: "This House doth approve of the affection of their brethren of Scotland in their desire of a conformity of church government between the two nations, and doth give them thanks for it. And, as they have already taken into consideration the reformation of church government, so they will proceed therein in due time as shall best conduce to the glory of God and peace of the Church."

From this answer both Houses refused to swerve, and with a verbal alteration it stood in that form in the final words of the treaty, as ratified by bill in August, 1641.

Two points appear plain from the account of this

[1] L. J., iv. 216. [2] *Ibid.*, v. 224. [3] D'Ewes *Diary*, ii. 191.

debate of the 15th May as preserved in D'Ewes' *MS.*: (1) That the answer of the Commons was framed on a previously prepared, though more curt and ungracious, answer of the Commissioners; (2) that the House did not at all touch upon the substance of the Scots request. The only division of opinion was upon the question of the use of the words, "and do give them thanks." The question of the uniformity of church government—the substantive proposition of the Scotch paper—was not alluded to apparently by a single speaker.[1]

Such was the fate of the first negotiation between Scotland and England on this subject of the introduction of a Presbyterian system into England.

When the subject was again taken up, it was on the initiative not of the Scots but of the English. That initiative was, however, only taken under the pressure of sheer necessity, and the course of the negotiations shows with what reluctance the final step of calling in Scotch aid was adopted. From the moment all doubts were removed as to the outbreak of war, it became an object of great consideration for both sides to secure the neutrality or the goodwill of the Scotch nation. A diplomatic rivalry ensued on this merely negative policy, and it is plain that until the return of their Commissioners from the futile

[1] *Cf.* Clarendon, iii. 294. "There had been a general inclination to return a rough answer and reproof for their intermeddling in anything that related to the laws of England. But by the extraordinary industry and subtlety of those who saw that business was not yet ripe, and who alleged that it was only wished not proposed, and, therefore, that a sharp reply was not merited, the above gentle answer was returned.

negotiations at Oxford in the spring of 1643, a party among the Scots themselves thought neutrality the only possible attitude. They stood, and it pleased them to think that they should so stand, as mediators between two belligerent powers, with a truly national loyalty to the person of their Prince, but with a full knowledge that their interests lay with the English Parliament; and it required the actual teaching of events to convince them of the impracticableness of such a policy.

During this interim period of diplomacy, the subject of church government was at first avoided by the English Parliament, and then treated with almost all their accustomed caution. On the occasion of the meeting of the General Assembly of the Scottish Church, which had been called for 26th July, 1642, the Commons drew up a declaration "how affairs stand here," wherein they assured the Assembly that if war could be avoided "we do not doubt that we shall settle matters . . . in Church and State to the . . . glory of God by the advancement of the true religion, and such a reformation of the Church as shall be agreeable to God's word."[1] A previous declaration, in April, sent to the "Great Council," had been still more unsatisfactory and vague. The reply of the General Assembly to the former of these was of a nature to convince the Parliament that Scotch aid, if ever required, would only be obtained on one condition—uniformity of Church government. They complained of the slowness of the reformation of religion in England, surmising that

[1] L. J., v. 228.

God had some quarrel with England for this, and with a reference to the demand of their Commissioners in the Treaty of London, 1641, proceeded to lay down their main requirement. (4) "The Assembly doth renew the proposition made by the aforesaid Commissioners for beginning the work of reformation at the uniformity of Kirk government. For what hope can there be of unity in religion, of one confession of faith, one form of worship, and one catechism, till there be one form of ecclesiastical government. Yea what hope can the kingdom and Kirk of Scotland have of a firm and durable peace till prelacy . . . be plucked up root and branch.

(5) The prelatical hierarchy being put out of the way, the work will be easy without forcing any conscience to settle in England the government of the reformed kirks by assemblies; for although the reformed kirks do hold their kirk officers and kirk government by assemblies higher and lower in their strong and beautiful subordination to be *jure divino* and perpetual, yet prelacy . . . is almost universally acknowledged to be an human ordinance."

This declaration of the General Assembly was unanimously approved by the secret council on the 18th August, 1642, and forwarded to the English Parliament. It was communicated to the Commons on the 26th, but not debated there till the 1st of September. It will be seen from D'Ewes' notes of this debate, and from the reply subsequently drawn up, that the effect of the Scotch declaration was instantaneous, but only in one direction. There no longer remained any idea of preserving

Episcopacy in any form, modified, purified, or otherwise, but none the less the Parliament avoided giving any pledge on the subject of a Presbyterian system of government, referring itself rather to the deliberations of an assembly of divines. On both points there seems to have been practical unanimity in these debates.

After the reading of the declaration of the Assembly, "there followed," says D'Ewes, "many speeches thereupon, I cannot say any debate, for all men argued for the abolishing of bishops after Mr. Rous had first made the motion, and scarce a man spake for them. About two of the clock Mr. Solicitor and others desired that we might put off the debate till Saturday morning next ensuing, because, it being a matter of great weight, we might argue it upon the greater premeditation. And I thought the House so strongly inclined this way as I went out of the House about the time, but, after my departure, the House sat till about three of the clock, and then voted the abolishing of them."[1]

Five days later (6th September) the reply of the Commons was presented from Committee and forwarded to the Lords, who consented to it with a few verbal alterations.[2] This reply deserves attention:

> We acknowledge it an act of love that our brethren in Scotland have bestowed their serious thoughts for unity of religion, that in all His Majesty's dominions there might be one confession of faith, one directory of worship, one publick catechism, and one form of Church government. And although it will hardly be punctually obtained and exactly unless some way

[1] 1st Sept., D'Ewes *MSS.*, B 312. [2] C. J. ii. 754.

might be found for mutual communication and conjunction of counsel and debate in framing that one form: yet both intending the same end, proceeding by the same rule of God's word, and guided by the same spirit, we hope, by God's assistance, to be directed so, that we may cast out whatsoever is offensive to God or justly displeasing to any neighbour church, and so far agree with our brethren of Scotland and other reformed churches in all substantial parts of doctrine, worship, and discipline, that both we and they may enjoy those advantages and conveniences which are mentioned by them in this their answer to the more strict union of both kingdoms, more safe and easy government of his Majesty, and both to himself and people more free communion in all holy exercises and duties of worship, more constant security of religion against . . . the Papists, and deceitful errors of other sectaries, and more profitable use of the ministry, for the compassing and attaining whereof we intend to use the labour and advice of an assembly of godly learned divines, for the convening of whom a bill hath already passed both Houses.

The main cause which hitherto hath deprived us of these and other great advantages which we might have by a more close union with the Church of Scotland and other reformed churches is the government by bishops . . . and . . . we do declare that this government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans and chapters, etc., is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, a great impediment to reformation and growth of religion, very prejudicial to the state and government of the kingdom, and that we are resolved that the same shall be taken away. And, according to our former declaration of the 7th of February, our purpose is to consult with godly and learned divines that we may not only remove this, but settle such a government as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and happy union with the Church of Scotland and other reformed churches abroad, and to establish the

same by a law which we intend to frame for that purpose, to be presented to his Majesty for his royal assent.

Such a declaration is indicative at once of the past and of the impending action of the English Parliament on the subject of Church reform. The General Assembly of 1641 had appointed Henderson to draw up a confession of faith, a catechism, a directory for all parts of the public worship, and a platform of Church government, "wherein possibly England and we might agree."[1] The succeeding Assembly of 1642 had been greeted by a letter from a number of English ministers at London showing their desire of a Presbyterian government. But such was not the attitude of the House of Commons. A few months later the Parliament was driven to throw itself unconditionally into the arms of the Scotch, but its whole precedent and subsequent action shows its determination to control the reconstructing of the national Church in its own sense, in a lay sense, in an English sense—by the help of an assembly of divines, and with a desire of approximation to the best reformed churches, but none the less with a repugnance to the pure Scotch Presbyterian system.[2]

At the conclusion of the General Assembly (13th August, 1642), a standing commission had been named to watch over the negotiations with England. It was to

[1] Baillie, i. 364.

[2] Clarendon (iii. 298) maintains that the Scotch imagined that England would never accept their ultimatum of "uniformity." The statement deserves no credit, but it is indicative of the *impression* of one party.

this body that the Parliament's declarations of September were sent. In their joy at the nature of those declarations, they at once proceeded to nominate a body of commissioners to be in readiness to carry out actual negotiations; but for this final step there was wanting the same alacrity on the part of the Parliament. "At that time the King, being desperate of our assistance, and the Parliament apprehending no need of it, we were no more solicited by either; so for a long time lay very calm and secure. But after Kentown and Brainford, or thereabouts, when Newcastle had gathered his northern army, the Parliament thought meet to crave help from us, there was great word of commissioners coming from them to our Council, and it was a wonder, if they desired any help, that they denied to use better means for its obtaining. But such was their (as I take it) oversight, that they used no other means but a declaration of their desires to have our help according to the late treaty."[1] The hesitation which Baillie notices in these words was not due to oversight, but to indecision on the part of the Parliament. On the 2nd November, 1642, the Commons passed a declaration inviting Scotch aid. This declaration the Lords put on one side, and, although on the falling through of the negotiations between the King and the Parliament, the Lords adopted it, a month passed before the messengers to carry the invitation were named. As it was, the expectation of an agreement with the King was strong enough to defer the adoption of this final step. The

[1] Baillie's *Letters*, ii. 58.

negotiations with Charles, which had been broken off in November, were renewed at Oxford in February, 164$\frac{2}{3}$. The "Treaty of Oxford" lasted from the 4th of March to the 15th of April. It was for the purpose of these negotiations that the Houses hurried through their bills for the Assembly and for the abolition of Episcopacy. Clarendon represents the adoption of the latter measure as a mere ruse, the House not intending to insist on it, "very probably their departing from their proposition of the Church might be the most powerful argument to the King to gratify them with the militia" (iii. 378). The suggestion is a mere perversion of fact. Parliament had gradually arrived at the determination to abolish Episcopacy and to reconstruct the national Church by the help of an assembly of divines in the course of the debates of 1641 and 1642, through the lessons of the events of those years, and through the intensification of its own feeling and the rise of popular opinion. From that position the Parliament could not recede, even if it had wished, and even though it knew that to insist on these proposals would be fatal to the success of the negotiations. The Scottish Commissioners who had been destined for London had been detained in Oxford by Charles, and to the Parliament's request to allow those to proceed to London, according to their instructions, Charles replied on the 18th of April by a practical refusal.[1] On the 1st May, the Commons accordingly took the final step, and requested the Lords to join with them in sending members

[1] L. J., vi. 10.

from both Houses as commissioners into Scotland. It was not until the 27th, and upon reiterated messages from the Commons, that the Lords acceded to the proposition, and named as their commissioner Lord Gray of Warke. The Commons at once nominated on their behalf Sir William Armyn and Henry Darley. Three weeks later, the Commons added to their number Sir Henry Vane (the younger) and Hatcher; but it was not until the 11th of July that the Lords took the corresponding step of nominating the Earl of Rutland. Meanwhile the Scottish Estates had met on the 22nd June, and were waiting in great perplexity the arrival of the promised commissioners. "Yet there was no word of them. All did much admire that not so much as one excuse was made of this so great neglect. Some did conjecture one cause, some another. Some did think them so overwhelmed with plots and dangers that they were amazed. . . Yet the most thought the greatest cause of their irresolution to flow from their division. The House of Lords was said to be opposite to the Commons' conclusion of craving our help."[1]

There is much truth in the latter surmise, but it was not as a mere faction or party that the Lords hesitated to invite into England a Scottish army and a Scottish Covenant. But, whatever lingering hope either House may have had that the final step might yet be avoided, was swept away by the events of June and July; and the reflexion proves how the Solemn League and Covenant

[1] Baillie, ii. 79.

was purely a thing of necessity. Those two months mark the lowest point in the ebb of the Parliament's fortune. During the past three months Waller's plot, the treachery of the Hothams, the successive defeats of the Fairfaxes in Yorkshire and Waller in Devonshire, and the surrender of Bristol, had constituted an almost unbroken series of Royalist successes. And there is a remarkable parallelism between these events and the action of the two Houses in the matter of the Scotch negotiations.

Pym made his report concerning Waller's plot on the 6th June. On the same day the Lords agreed to the ordinance empowering the assembly of divines to meet. Three days later the Commons ordered instructions to be brought in for their commissioners intended for Scotland. Charles's proclamation declaring the Parliament no longer a free Parliament was received on the 27th of June. On the same day the Lords agreed to the despatch of Corbett as a preliminary commissioner to Scotland. On the 30th June the Fairfaxes were beaten by Newcastle at Adwalton; the news of this was followed by the renewed treachery of Hotham at Lincoln (2nd July). Three days later the Commons resolved that the Scotch nation should be forthwith desired to send in aid and assistance. On the same day the Lords resolved, "That this House will send two lords as commissioners into Scotland by this day sevennight, or sooner if they can be ready, and do concur with the Commons that one of their instructions shall be to desire the aid and assistance of the Scotch nation."

This parallelism could be further illustrated, but it is needless. The facts which prove it are well known. And, intrinsically, the interest of the question lies not in these minor fluctuations of resolution on the eve of the great negotiations. The way for the Covenant had been paved, not in 1642, but in 1641, when the only chance for a compromise on the Church question had been lost, and when the Commons determined on a more radical scheme, based on the advice of the assembly. Such was the attitude of Parliament at the opening of the war. Had the success of the Parliament been immediate and decisive, as was at one time expected, the Church question would have been treated in a purely national sense, probably on the lines sketched out in the debates on the Root-and-branch Bill. There may have been—there doubtless would have been—some concession to clerical feeling, but there would not have been, as there subsequently was, a formation of presbyteries, parochial and classical, possessing censorial powers, and proceeding by legal methods. There would have been none of the Scotch element of *Jurisdiction* in the English Church of the years 1643-51. As it was, no sooner had it become apparent that the war could not be finished at a stroke, than the necessity of securing Scotland for the Parliamentary cause was at once seen. The only possible condition was the adoption of the Covenant—of a uniformity of Church government—so much was known from the first; the question then became one of time, or of the immediate fortune of the war. Fortune declared against the Parliament, and

the Covenant was accepted. It may be that a slight portion of the Commons had no dislike for a pure Presbyterian system—it is certain that a Presbyterian party had sprung up amongst the clergy—it may also be that the course of the ecclesiastical debates of the year 1641 had educated the majority of the Commons, or had habituated them to the conceptions and terminology of a primitive Presbyterian system in the abstract, but none the less the final adoption of the Covenant was, under the circumstances, of the nature of a capitulation.

The instructions to the commissioners were reported by Pym from committee on the 12th July, 1643, and agreed to and sent up to the Lords on the following day. The Lords agreed to them on the 15th. To these was subsequently added the declaration to the assembly of divines in Scotland, which was accepted by the Upper House on the 19th, under which date all the papers are entered in the Journals. There is no further trace in the negotiations of the hesitancy which had marked the proceedings of the last three months. The commissioners landed at Leith of the 4th of August; by the 18th the draught of the Covenant had been completed and despatched to the English Parliament. It reached London on the 26th, was at once referred to the assembly, and adopted in principle in the Commons on the 5th September. The arrival of commissioners from Scotland facilitated the speedy settlement of disputed points, and on the 18th the Lords adopted the Covenant. It was solemnly sworn to by both Houses at St. Margaret's on the 22nd.

The conclusion was foregone, but there are two points that should, perhaps, be taken into consideration in the final estimation of the transaction. The first has been explained with great succinctness by Mr. Gardiner.[1] In the first draught of the Covenant, as agreed upon at Edinburgh, Vane had proposed an amendment by adding after the words, "the Church of Scotland in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government," the words "according to the word of God." When the Covenant was referred to the assembly of divines at Westminster, this amendment was retained, along with another of the Assembly's own, defining the Prelacy, which it was desired to abolish, as that which consisted in archbishops, bishops, etc. The scope of both amendments is plain. The former would pledge the Covenanted Parliament to the Scottish system only in so far as it was found agreeable to the word of God; the latter gave it freedom in the construction it put upon the word Prelacy—in the view it took of the then existing Church system. Practically both amendments were retained in the final form of the Covenant.

Secondly, before its final adoption both Houses insisted on being satisfied by the Assembly at Westminster that the Covenant could be taken in point of conscience, and they joined in requiring the Assembly to set forth a declaration stating the reasons and grounds of the opinion which they had thereupon expressed of that lawfulness in point of conscience.

[1] *Civil War*, ii. 268.

The latter exception is, however, under the circumstances comparatively meaningless. It did not detract from the simple fact that the English Parliament, under the pressure of necessity, had forfeited its future freedom of action in matter of Church reform—that it had pledged itself to a particular policy.

It may, perhaps, be thought that the problem on which I have tried to throw light in these pages is, after all, an easy one. The broad facts of the adoption of the Covenant, and of the subsequent partial establishment of a Presbyterian system, stand out in bold relief in the history of the period. They may seem, at first sight, perfectly congruous, and consistent, and clear. Such, however, is by no means the case. The problem is perhaps one of the most difficult in the whole range of English history. These pages have dealt only with one side of the question, its treatment in Parliament. It has still to be explained how a section of the English clergy came to adopt Presbyterian views in their extremity, as a section of them undoubtedly did. It has still to be shown what were the numbers of that section of the English clergy, and an even more difficult question is that of the popular acceptance of it. How was the English nation schooled or prepared for the reception of an un-English institution at the hands of its rulers and clergy? How did it, in fact and deed, actually accept it and practise it? It is well known that in the end the Parliament refused to leave an uncontrolled jurisdictional power in the hands of the Presbyteries. They restricted them to a specified list of offences in the exercise of suspension; any offence

not included in that list could only be made the ground of excommunication after being represented to and approved by a parliamentary committee at Westminster. The Parliament, too, was made the final instance of appeal. Other considerations will recur to the mind as illustrating the limitations on the system imposed by the civil authority. This aspect of the question has long been known, though perhaps not yet estimated in accordance with its proper significance. But there is still one remaining problem in this question as to the actual practice of the Presbyterian system in England, and that is simply as to the extent to which it was established in the country. How many counties adopted the system? To this question it is impossible at present to return an answer. It is generally said that the classical system was worked only in London and Lancashire. The statement is grossly incorrect. Essex was mapped out into classes by a parliamentary ordinance, probably Derbyshire was; Devonshire may have been. Traces of classes exercising at least the function of ordination occur at Newcastle (perhaps as a classis of a Northumberland province), and in Warwickshire, Cheshire, Shropshire, Gloucester, Somerset, perhaps also in Suffolk. This question is further complicated by the existence of a difference of *kind* among these associations; some of them were purely voluntary associations of ministers, or ministers and elders combined, for the purposes of catechising and ordination. Such was the basis of the organisations existing at Nottingham, in Worcestershire, Cumberland, Westmorland, Cheshire, and doubtless elsewhere. But

where? That is the question. For such a question only one solution is possible—the production of the records of these associations. It may, and certainly ought to, excite surprise that as yet only one such document has been published—the Wirksworth Minutes—and that these volumes of the Chetham Society are the first that have been published with regard to Lancashire—the seat and centre of the system in its greatest purity and activity.

So much may be said, and ought to be understood, as to the real nature of the difficulty of this problem of Commonwealth Church history. But first and last (and this by way of recapitulation, and to justify the length to which I have drawn out this Introduction), the main problem for the student of history remains, that of the *spirit* of the resolution. Once in the course of English history the clergy and people were led to the adoption, however partial, of an un-English system. To understand the significance of this revolution, its causes, its effects, there is need of correct and minute knowledge, and also of a sympathy and intuition that can bridge over the gulf between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries—centuries dissimilar in all the main problems of national life, social, religious, and political. All that is asked here is careful attention to whatever addition to the stock of knowledge on the subject may have been furnished in these pages, and an exercise on the part of the reader of that large-minded sympathy which lies at the root of nineteenth century tolerance.

THE LANCASHIRE PETITION, AND THE ORDINANCE FOR THE CLASSES.

"THE humble petition of many thousands of the well-affected gentlemen, ministers, freeholders, and other inhabitants of the County Palatine of Lancaster," was presented to the House of Lords on the 25th August, 1646. (L. J., viii. 470.)

It was read, and thanks returned to the petitioners.

On the following Thursday, August 27, 1646, the petition was ordered to be received in the Commons House on the next day, Saturday, 28th August (C. J., iv. 654), but no mention of it occurs under that date in the Journals, and it was not until the 15th of September that the petition was read in the Commons. On the same day the ordinance was introduced for dividing the county into classical presbyteries. (C. J., iv. 669.)

Die Martis, 15 September, 1646.

A petition directed to both Houses of Parliament, styled "The humble petition of many thousands of the well-affected gentlemen, ministers, freeholders, and other inhabitants of the county palatine of Lancaster," was this day read.

A division of the county of Lancaster into nine classical presbyteries, together with the names of ministers and other persons fit to be of the said several classes, was this day read.

The scheme having passed the Commons, the Lords, on the 22nd September, appointed a committee to consider it, the committte consisting of the Earls of Kent, Pembroke, Sarum, Warwick, Manchester, and Lords Wharton and Hunsdon. (L. J., viii. 498.)

The committee reported, and the measure passed on the 2nd of October following. (L. J., viii. 507.)

Die Veneris, 2 Octobris, 1646.

The division of the several classes of Lancashire was read and agreed to.

Resolved, &c., that the House do approve of the division of the county of Lancaster into the nine classical presbyteries represented from the said county.

Resolved, &c., that the House do approve of the ministers and other persons represented from the county of Lancaster as fit to be of the several and respective classes into which the said county is divided.

The measure received no further constitutional sanction, but was promulgated as an ordinance of both Houses.

The copy of the petition which follows is taken from the Lords Journals, viii. 470. The ordinance constituting the nine presbyterian classes is copied from the Commons Journals, iv. 669–670.

"To the Right Honourable the House of Peers and to the Honourable the House of Commons assembled in the Commons House of Parliament.

The humble petition of many thousands of the well-affected gentlemen, ministers, freeholders, and other inhabitants of the county palatine of Lancaster,

Sheweth:

That we thankfully acknowledge the unwearied labours and endeavours for the public good in these hazardous and distracted times, and desire with you to magnify the Lord of hosts, who hath crowned the councils and armies with such glorious successes, by which, through the wonderful goodness of God, in our hopes we were almost come to a period of this unnatural war, which hath well-nigh ruined many families, towns, and counties that lay under the doleful miseries of it; and to the obtaining of a happy peace, and of that which ourselves most long for, a thorough reformation of religion according to our Solemn Covenant, by which we conceive ourselves indispensably bound in the literal sense thereof; yet to our irrepressible grief we find that, through the not settling of church government, schism, error, heresy, profaneness, and blasphemy wofully spread, separate congregations are erected and multiplied, sectaries grow insolent, confidently expecting a toleration through the misconstruction of the late declaration (as we believe), and through the encouragement of some in eminent place, to the great astonishment of the orthodox nobility, gentry, ministry, and others well affected of both kingdoms; that endeavours are used to break

the happy correspondency between these honourable Houses and the renowned city of London, whose known and acknowledged expense of blood and treasure for the defence of the Parliament in its lowest condition will not, we hope, in this time of your successes, be forgotten: that the reverend and learned Assembly of Divines of both kingdoms doth receive great discouragement in their great pains, pious endeavours, and faithful advices: that some incendiaries, in direct opposition to our Solemn League and Covenant and other deep engagements with our dear brethren of Scotland (whose embarking with us in the same cause and war in depth of winter, when our enemies were most proud and potent, and whose councils and armies have been so seasonably helpful to our distressed county and this distressed kingdom), do seek occasions to foment jealousies and heighten differences, that they might imbroil the kingdom in a second and more deadly destructive war than the former: that though the kingdom be almost cleared of the common enemy, yet considerable forces have not been sent to the relief of bleeding Ireland, to the great discouragement of the Protestant party there. For the remedy of which dangerous and growing evils, threatening the ruin of Church and State (the safety whereof you are intrusted with by God and the kingdom), we humbly beseech these honourable Houses

That you would lay hold on the first opportunity of procuring a safe and well-grounded peace in the three kingdoms:

That that discipline and government which is most agreeable to the Word of God and the example of the best reformed churches, according to the advice of the Assembly of Divines of both kingdoms, may with all possible speed be perfected and confirmed by your civil action:

That some strict and speedy course may be taken for the suppressing of all separate congregations of Anabaptists, Brownists, heretics, schismatics, blasphemers, and other sectaries, which do or shall refuse to submit to the said discipline and government:

That such refusers and members of such separate congregations may be removed and kept out of all places of public trust, that according to the Covenant and treaties means of union (not of division) of the two nations may be studied and promoted:

That the city of London, in their adherence to the Covenant, may not receive the least discouragement, much less any mark of displeasure, from the honourable Houses:

That the endeavours and advice of the Assembly of Divines may be duly encouraged and accepted:

That the orthodox Presbyterian noblemen, gentlemen, ministers, and others well affected (whose prayers, endeavours, and examples were from the first a special means of engaging God and the kingdom to you) may not now be neglected or disappointed of the hopes raised in them by the Covenant and your former remonstrances and declarations:

That speedy and seasonable supplies may be sent unto the kingdom of Ireland before it be utterly lost.

Lastly, that it would please these honourable Houses in your wisdoms and justice not to interpret the humble boldness of your petitioners to be a cleaving to any party or in the least kind a reflecting upon any of your privileges, but only to proceed from our sad and sincere hearts, out of the deep sense and apprehension of our fears and dangers, and in pursuance of our Covenant, according to which we have been and ever shall be ready to spend and be spent for you.

All which we humbly submit to the wisdom of these honourable Houses, and shall ever pray, &c.

[Same day] THE ANSWER OF THE LORDS TO THE PETITION.

The Lords take well the petition of those of the county of Lancaster wherein they do express their zeal to the settling of the reformation of religion according to the Covenant, and for their desire of suppression of schism, heresy, profaneness, and blasphemy, and for their expressing of their desires for continuing

of the union and good correspondency betwixt these kingdoms of England and Scotland, all which the Lords hold themselves equally obliged by their Solemn League and Covenant; and for your declaring of your good affections to the Parliament and the public good of these kingdoms they have commanded me to give you thanks, and to let you know that as to the particulars of your petition they will take them into their due consideration.

A Division of the County of Lancaster into Nine Classical Presbyteries, together with the Names of Ministers and other Persons fit to be of the said several Classes.

Die Veneris, 2° Octobris, 1646.

The county palatine of Lancaster is divided into nine classical presbyteries following:—

The first classis to contain:

Manchester parish, Prestwich parish, Oldham parish, Flixton parish, Eccles parish, and Ashton-under-Line parish.

The ministers fit to be of the first classis:

Mr. Richard Heyrick and Mr. Richard Hollingworth of Manchester, Mr. John Angier of Denton, Mr. William Walker of Newton, Mr. Toby Furnes of Prestwich, Mr. Humphrey Barnet of Oldham, Mr. John Jones of Eccles, Mr. John Harrison of Ashton-under-Line.

Others fit to be of the first classis:

Robert Hyde of Denton, Esquire; Richard Howorth of Manchester, Esquire; Robert Ashton of Shepley, Esquire; Thomas Strangewaies of Gorton, Esquire; William Booth of Reddish,

gentleman; John Gaskell of Manchester, gentleman; Edward Sandiforth of Oldham, gentleman; John Birch of Openshaw, gentleman; Thomas Smyth of Manchester, gentleman; Peter Sergeant of Pilkington, gent.; Robert Leech of Ashton parish, gent.; John Wright of Bradford, yeoman; William Peake of Worseley, yeoman; Thomas Taylor of Flixton parish, yeoman; Thomas Barlowe of Eccles parish, yeoman; Peter Seddon of Pilkington, yeoman; James Jolly of Droilsden, gent.

The second classis to contain:

Boulton parish, Bury parish, Middleton parish, Rochdale parish, Deane parish, Radcliffe parish.

The ministers fit to be of the second classis:

Master John Harper of Bolton, Mr. William Ashton of Middleton, Mr. Wm. Alte, Mr. Andrew Lathom, Mr. Jonathan Scolfield of Bury, Mr. Robert Bathe of Rochdale, Mr. Alexander Horrocks, Mr. Jo. Tilsely [Tilsley], Mr. James Walton of Deane, Mr. Thomas Pyke of Radcliffe.

Others fit to be of the second classis:

Ralph Ashton of Middleton, Esquire; John Bradshaw of Bradshaw, Esquire; Edmund Hopwood of Hopwood, Esquire; Robert Leaver of Darcy-Leaver, gentleman; John Andrewes of Little Leaver, gent.; Arthur Smethurst of Heape, gent.; Thomas Evershall of Bury, gent.; Edward Butterworth of Belfield, Esquire; John Scolfield of Castleton, yeoman; Emmanuel Thompson of Rochdale, clothier; Samuel Wylde of Rochdale, mercer; James Scot of Healy, gent.; Robert Pares of Rochdale, gent.; Ralph Worthington of Snithill [Smithill], Esquire; Gyles Greene of West Houghton, yeoman; Henry Molyneux of West Houghton, gent.; Henry Seddon of Heaton, yeoman; Roger Hardman of Radcliffe, yeoman; John Bradshaw of Darcy-Leaver, gent.; Richard Dickonson of Aynsworth, yeoman.

The third classis to contain:

Blackburne parish, Whalley parish, Chipping parish, Riblechester parish.

The ministers fit to be of the third classis :

Master Adam Boulton of Blackburne, Master Robert Worthington of Harwood, Mr. Richard Redman of Low Church, Mr. Wm. Walker of Whalley, Mr. Henry Morrice of Burnley, Mr. John Bryers of Padtham [Padiham], Mr. William Ingham of Church, Mr. John King of Chipping.

Others fit to be of the third classis :

Sir Ralph Ashton, Barronet ; Richard Shuttleworth, senior, Esquire ; Richard Shuttleworth, junior, Esquire ; John Starkie, Esquire ; Jo. Parker, Esquire ; Richard Ashton of Downham, Esquire ; John Livesay of Livesay, gentleman ; Thomas Barcrofte of Barcrofte, gent. ; Nicholas Cunliffe of Wycollar, gent. ; John Cunliffe of Hollins, gent. ; Robert Cunliffe of Sparth, gent. ; Nicholas Rishton of Auteley, gent. ; Roger Geliborn of Berdwood, gent. ; William Yates of Blackburn, gent. ; John Howorth of Clayton, gent. ; Thomas Whalley of Rishton, gent. ; Charles Gregory of Haslinden, gentleman.

The fourth classis to contain :

Warrington parish, Winwicke parish, Leigh parish, Wigan parish, Holland parish, Prescot parish.

The ministers fit to be of the fourth classis :

Master Charles Herle of Winwicke, Mr. Thomas Norman of Newton, Mr. James Wood of Ashton, Mr. William Leigh of New Church, Mr. Henry Atherton of Hollinfaire, Mr. Bradley Hayhurst of Leigh, Mr. Thomas Crompton of Astley, Mr. James Bradshaw of Wigan, Mr. Thomas Tonge of Hindley, Mr. Hen. Shaw of Holland, Mr. Wm. Plant of Farnworth, Mr. Richard Modesley of Ellins [St. Helens], Mr. Timothy Smith of Rainesforth, Mr. John Wright of Billing.

Others fit to be of the fourth classis :

Wm. Ashhurst of Ashhurst, Esq.; Peter Brooke of Sankie, Esq.; Wm. Vernon of Shakerley, gent.; John Daubabin [Dunbabin] of Warrington, gent.; Thomas Risley of Warrington, gent.; Robert Whatmough of Winwick, gent. ; Gilbert Eden of Winwick,

gent.; John Ashton of Newton, gent.; George Aynsworth of Newton, yeoman; James Pilkington of Ashton, gent.; Arthur Leech of Westleigh, yeoman; Peter Smith of Westleigh, yeoman; Richard Ashtley of Tildesley, gent.; Thomas Guest of Astley, yeoman; Henry Morrice of Atherton, gent.; Alexander Thompson of Wigan, gent.; Peter Harrison of Hin[d]ley, gent.; Thomas Sephton of Skernsdale, gent.; Jeffery Birchall of Orrell, gent.; John Lathom of Whiston, gent.; George Deane of Ra[i]n-hill, yeoman; William Barnes of Sankie, gent.; John Marsh of Beld [Bold], gent.; John Rylands of Sutton, yeoman; Thurstan Peak of Warrington, gent.; Ewan Heaton of Billing, gent.; Roger Topping of Dalton, yeoman; Peter Leyland of Haddock, yeoman.

The fifth classis to contain:

Walton parish, Hayton parish, Childwall parish, Sephton parish, Aulker [Altcar] parish, Northmeals parish, Halsal parish, Ormeskirke parish, Aughton parish.

The ministers fit to be of the fifth classis:

Master Wm. Ward of Walton, Mr. John Fog of Liverpoole, Mr. Robert Port of Toxteth, Mr. Richerd Pickering of Kirkeby, Mr. Wm. Norcot of Darby, Mr. Wm. Bell of Hayton [Huyton], Master David Ellison of Childwall, Mr. Hen. Bolton of Hale, Mr. Joseph Thompson of Sephton, Mr. John Kid of Crosby, Mr. Robert Seddon of Alker [Altcar], Mr. James Starkie of North Meals, Mr. Thomas Johnson of Halsall, Mr. Wm. Donne of Ormeskirke, Mr. James Warrall [Worrall] of Aughton.

Others fit to be of the fifth classis:

John Moore, Esq.; Gilbert Ireland, Esq.; Mr. John Williamson, senior, of Liverpool, gent.; Nicholas Cowp [? Cowper] of Kirkedale, yeoman; Edward Chambers of Liverpoole, yeoman; Jereiah Aspinwall of Toxteth, gent.; Peter Ambrose of Toxteth, gent.; Henry Woods of Kirkeby, yeoman; Thomas Thomson of Derby [West Derby], yeoman; Henry Mercer of Derby, gent.; Thomas Tyrer of Hayton [Huyton], yeoman; Bryan Soothwork

of Tarbocke, yeoman ; Wm. Plumbe of Woolton, gent. ; John Williamson of Woolton, yeoman ; Thomas Rothwell of Ince, yeoman ; Wm. Watkinson of Blowick, yeoman; James Mosse of Crossens, gent. ; Thomas Hesketh of Halsall, gent. ; Wm. Wilson of Lidyate, yeoman; Thomas Bootle of Melling, gent. ; Hugh Cooper of Ormeskirke, gent. ; Peter Blundell of Scarisbrick, gent. ; James Crosse of Aughton, gent.

The sixth classis to contain :

Croston parish, Leyland parish, Standish parish, Eccleston parish, Penwortham parish, Hoole parish, Brindle parish.

The ministers fit to be of the sixth classis :

Master James Hyet of Croston, Mr. Paul Lathom of Standish, Mr. Edward Gee of Eccleston, Mr. Henry Welch of Chorley, Mr. James Langley of Leyland, Mr. Ralph Marsden of Brindell.

Others fit to be of the sixth classis :

Sir Richard Houghton, Barronet ; Peter Catterall of Crook, Esq. ; Thomas Wilson of Wrightington, gent. ; John Cliffe of Brotherton, gent. ; John Benson of Winnell, gent. ; Ralph Leaver of Chorley, gent. ; Roger Haddock of Chorley, yeoman ; Edward Doughty of Adlington, yeoman ; John Pincock of Euxton, yeoman ; Alexander Chisnall of Whittle, yeoman ; George Dardy of Croston, yeoman ; Thomas Wasley of Chorley, yeoman ; John Crane of Eccleston, yeoman ; John Cowdray of Longton, yeoman.

The seventh classis to contain :

Preston parish, Kirkeham parish, Garstange parish, Poulton parish.

The ministers fit to be of the seventh classis :

Master Isaac Ambrose of Preston, Mr. Robert Yates of Preston, Mr. Edward Fleetwood of Kirkham, Mr. Thomas Cranage of Gosenargh, Mr. Christopher Edmundson of Garstange, Mr. John Sumner of Poulton.

Others fit to be of the seventh classis :

Alexander Rigby, Esq. ; William Laughton, Esq. ; Matthew Addison of Preston, gentleman ; Wm. Sudall of Preston, gent. ; Wm. Collam of Preston, gent. ; Edward Downes of Wellam, gent. ; Ro. Wilkins of Kirkham, yeoman ; Edmund Turner of Goosenarge, yeoman ; Thomas Nickson of Plompton, gent. ; Edward Veal of Layton [Laughton], Esq. ; Robert Crane of Leaton, gent. ; Wm. Latewise of Caterall, gent. ; Richard Whitehead of Garstange, gent.

The eighth classis to contain :

Lancaster parish, Cockeram parish, Claughton parish, Melling parish, Tatham parish, Tunstall parish, W[h]ittington parish, Warton parish, Bolton [le Sands] parish, Halton parish, Hesom [Heysham] parish.

The ministers fit to be of the eighth classis :

Master Nehemiah Barnet of Lancester, Mr. John Sill of Gressingham, Mr. Peter Atkinson of Ellell, Mr. Nicholas Smith of Tatham, Mr. Richard Jackson of Whittington, Mr. Rd. Walker of Warton, Mr. John Jaques of Bolton [le Sands], Mr. Thomas Whitehead of Halton.

Others fit to be of the eighth classis :

Henry Porter of Lancester, gent. ; Wm. Wast of Middleton, gent. ; Wm. Turner of Melling, gent. ; Thomas Rippon of Lancaster, gent. ; Wm. Gardner of Glasson, gent. ; George Toulson of Lancaster, gent. ; Thomas Toulson of Lancaster, gent. ; Thomas Claiton of Wiersdale, gent. ; Wm. Greenbanke of Halton, yeoman ; James Thornton of Melling, yeoman ; Wm. Wither of Brownedge, yeoman ; Edmund Barwick of Highfield, yeoman ; Robert Eskrigg of Whittington, yeoman ; Henry Story of Storry, yeoman ; Christopher Shearson of Ellill, yeoman ; Henry Holme of Kellet, yeoman ; Robert Lucas of Kellet, yeoman ; Robert Curwen of Kellet, gentleman.

The ninth classis to contain:

Aldingham parish, Ureswick parish, Ulverston parish, Hawkeshead parish, Coulton parish, Doolton parish [Dalton], Cartmell parish, Kirkby parish, Vennington [Pennington] parish.

The ministers to be of the ninth classis:

Master Thomas Shaw of Aldingham, Mr. Philip Bennet of Ulvertson, Mr. Kempe of Hauxhead, Mr. Bryan Willow of Coulton, Mr. John Marigold of Cartmel.

Others fit to be of the ninth classis:

George Dodding, Esq.; Thomas Fell, Esq.; Edward Rigbye, Esq.; Adam Sands of Booth, gent.; John Sawry of Plumpton, gent.; Wm. Knipe of Cartmell, gent.; Robert Rawlinson of Greenehead, gent.; Thomas Fell of Scarthewhett, gent.; Thomas Daubson of Leese, yeoman; Richard Myres of Beeleefe, yeoman; Wm. Rawlinson of Grathwhet, gent.

THE FIRST CLASSIS

In the Countie Palatine of Lancaster,

CONTAINING

THE PARISHES OF MANCHESTER, PRESTWICH, OULDHAM, FLIXTON, ECCLES, AND ASHTON-UNDER-LINE,

As by an Ordinance of both Houses of Parliament Dat. Die Veneris 2° Octobris, 1646, *may appeare.*

The Minutes of the Manchester Classis.

[*For an Account of all the Ministers mentioned in these Minutes see the Appendix.*]

THE FIRST MEETING at Manchester, February 16° 164$\frac{6}{7}$.

Mr. Heyricke chosen moderator. Begunne with prayer.

1.— Elders of the congregation of Manchester elected for the classis appear'd: John Gaskell,[1] Edward Johnson,[2] Raph Briddocke,[3] Thomas Smith,[4] elders.

[1] John Gaskell, "draper of Manchester" (1636), signs the protestation of February, 164$\frac{3}{4}$ among the inhabitants of Unsworth-within-Pilkington, in the parish of Prestwich, also as constable of "Prestwidge." Between these two dates he had probably purchased Clifton Hall, in Prestwich parish, founding there the family of Gaskell of Clifton, from which descended the celebrated Lord Clive. John Gaskell's name appears in the Manchester Court Leet Records as early as 1619, when he was entrusted with the assize of bread, and it occurs almost yearly up to the probable date of his retiring to Prestwich—*e.g.*, 1622 churchwarden, 1631 constable, 1634 miselayer, 1637 market looker for corn. He subscribed largely (£10) to the Salford Chapel in 1634, and guaranteed £20 to Rosworm's support, and was also a feoffee of George Clarke's Charity, 1636. He was nominated a member of the Manchester classis by the parliamentary ordinance, but his name does not occur again in these minutes after the first meeting. The entry of his death occurs in the Prestwich registers June 24, 1653. "Sepult. John Gaskell."

[2] Edward Johnson, a cloth mercer of Manchester, the brother (not the son) of Henry Johnson, mercer. He died 9th June, (*Inq. p. m.*) and was buried 12th June, 1637. (Earwaker's *Manchetser Court Leet Records*, iv. 92, 104, and 207.) He signs the protestation of 164$\frac{3}{4}$ in the Third Division of Manchester (Deansgate?), subscribed 30*s.* to the Salford Chapel, and was a guarantor (£10) to the Rosworm Fund. His name occurs regularly in the Court Leet Records from 1625 onwards, thus: 1629 affairor of the court, 1632 sealer of leather, 1633 constable, 1638 borough-reeve, 1640 constable, 1650 borough-reeve. His death is noticed in these Leet Records (iv. 207), where Mr. Earwaker has printed a short account of his life with an abstract

Elders for the congregation at Prestwich: Mr. Tobie Furnace, minister; Peter Sergeant,[5] James Wroe,[6] James Taylor,[7] elders.

of his will, dated 3rd April, 1654. He was buried in Lord Derby's Chapel 2nd June, 1654. Will proved in Prerogative Court of Canterbury. A man of good repute, a trustee of George Marshall's Charity 1637, for the English Library in Pendleton's Chapel 1653, and for the College under Chetham's will. (See also M. C. L. R., iii. 140.)

[3] [Ralph Brideoke]. It was the opinion of Canon Parkinson that this Ralph, the Manchester elder, was the father of Ralph Brideoke of the Grammar School, afterwards Bishop of Chichester. The father of the bishop is invariably given as Richard, of Chetham [Hill]. But does this rest on any authority other than Wood? The Ralph mentioned here is probably the same with the Ralph Briddock of Cheetham, yeoman, who was buried 13th January, 165$\frac{7}{8}$. Will proved in Prerogative Court of Canterbury. It is not always easy to distinguish the two names. A Ralphe Brideoke signs the protestation of 164$\frac{1}{2}$ in the Huntsbank division of Manchester, was a subscriber (£3) to the Salford Chapel, and occurs among the electors of Major General Worsley to the parliament of 1654.

[4] His identity is uncertain. In the parliamentary ordinance he is described as Thomas Smyth, gentleman. A Thomas Smith appears in the Court Leet Records from 1647–1661, and as one of those who signed the return of Charles Worsley to the parliament 1636. But the last date at which the name of this elder appears in the minutes is 13th Dec., 1653. He may therefore have been the Thomas Smith, the well known "buckbinder" of Manchester, who was buried 27th February, 165$\frac{3}{4}$. This latter came to Manchester in 1624, but there are no entries in the Manchester Registers concerning his family until the year 163$\frac{7}{8}$. (See also *Early Booksellers and Stationers of Manchester*, Trans. Lanc. and Ches. Antiquarian Soc., vol. i.)

[5] Peter Sergeant, of Stand Lane, in Prestwich (Booker.) His name appears among the protestors of Whitfield within Pilkington, in the parish of Prestwich, as "Peeter Sargant, gentleman," immediately below that of "Thomas Sargant, gentleman," who may be the father. (Feb. 164$\frac{1}{2}$.) He was associated with Col. Holland in the assessing of the tax for the war against Spain, 1656. The entry of his death is in the Prestwich Registers. (Booker.) "1661, May 29th. Sepult Peter Sargant de Stand, gent."

[6] Of a yeoman family in Unsworth (Prestwich parish). Probably the son of a John or Robert Wroe. The name of James Wroe occurs among the protestors of Heaton township, in the parish of Prestwich (164$\frac{1}{2}$). The will of "James Wroe of Heaton" was proved at Chester in 1675.

[7] His name occurs among the protestors of 164$\frac{1}{2}$ under the "Hamlet of Heaton up Faughfield, within Prestwich." His further identity is uncertain. He may be the James Taylor of Pilsworth, whose administration was granted in the Chester Probate Court 1678. (Rec. Soc., xv. 264). A James Taylor was among Newcome's electors in 1656. But this is probably the one who occurs in the Court Leet Records as occupying a messuage in the Deansgate (iii. 246), and who took the oath of allegiance in October, 1661, among the inhabitants of Manchester.

Elders for Eccles : Thomas Barlow,[1] Thomas Rogers,[2] Thomas Warburton,[3] Tho. Fyldes,[4] elders.

Elders for the congregation of Ashton-under-Line : Mr. John Harrison, minister ; Captn Ashton of Shepley,[5] Robert Bardsley,[6] Edmund Heywood,[7] Robt Leech,[8] elders.

[1] May be the Thomas Barlow described as "de Mancester in Com. Lanc. husbandman," in a town deed of May, 1664. (M. C. L. R., v. 44.) The name occurs among the protestors of both Flixton and Eccles ($164\frac{1}{2}$), besides occurring in various identities in the Court Leet Records. The will of Thomas Barlow, of Barton-upon-Irwell, was proved at Chester 1687.

[2] At a later date John Rogers appears as the elder for Eccles, but in 1642 there were no Rogers at all resident in the parish. The will of "Thomas Rogers of Hulme, Manchester, yeoman," was proved at Chester 1669.

[3] Thomas Warburton was resident in Eccles in 1642 when he took the protestation. He may be the "Thomas Warburton of Prestwich" administration to whose effects was granted in 1685 in the Chester Probate Court.

[4] Thomas Fyldes was a churchwarden of Eccles in 1642. The name still continues at Eccles. At the end of the 17th century, James and John Fildes are found purchasing land in Monton for a meeting house for dissenters. The will of Thomas Fyldes, of Mounton, was proved at Chester in 1669.

[5] Robert, the eldest son of Thomas Ashton of Shepley, and Alice Sandford, born in 1604, was living at the time of Dugdale's Visitation, 1664. One of his daughters, Frances, became the wife of Robert Constantine the minister of Oldham. He was apparently a zealous member of the classis, but any other references to him are trifling. (*Vide* M. C. L. R., iii. 115, 265 ; iv. 558.) He heads the list of the protestors of Shepley, in Ashton-under-Lyne parish, as "Robt. Asheton, gent." (1642.) The entry of his death occurs in the Ashton Registers, "Feb. 27, $167\frac{9}{80}$, Robert Assheton, de Shepley, gentleman."

[6] Robert Bardsley held 24 acres in Waterhouses in 1618, and was living in "Waterhouses," in the parish of Ashton-under-Lyne, in 1642. He does not appear as an attender at the classis after 1654, but he may be the Robert Bardsley who was present at the taking of the oath of allegiance, 7th Oct., 1661. (M. C. L. R., iv. 211.)

[7] Edmund Heywood was a tanner and resident in 1642 in Littlemoss (parish of Ashton). In 1618, an Edmund Heywood held $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres there. The entry of his burial occurs in the Ashton Registers, "25th August, 1670, Edmund Heywood de Littlemoss."

[8] Robert Leech signs the protestation of $164\frac{1}{2}$ among the inhabitants of Littlemoss (Ashton), as Robert Leech, senior, with two sons. The following entries of burials are from the Ashton Registers : "17th August, 1682, Robert Leech de Littlemosse, junior ; September, 1682, Robert Leech de Littlemoss, senior."

That none appear'd from Newton, it is answered that the reason was because of some difference betwixt minister and people.

Mr. Jones, minister of Eccles, appear'd not. It is answered that hee was not able to come by reason of sicknesse.

Mr. Wilmore [Woolmer], minister at Flixton, appear'd not.

2.—Orders agreed on by this classis to bee observ'd by the members of all subsequent meetings:

(1) That a moderator bee chosen for the next meeting.
(2) That hee beginne and end with prayer.
(3) That none shall speake but to the moderator, with his hatt offe.
(4) That none shall beginne to speake till he who spake before bee sat downe.
(5) That hee who first stands up to speake shall first speake.
(6) That hee who hath not spoken to the present business shall speake (if hee desire it) before any that hath formerly spoken.
(7) That the precedent business be fully determined before the following bee begunne.

3.—It is agreed that all the ministers in this classis, for uniformity, shall, in the celebration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, bless the bread and wine severally.

4.—Elders are to goe to instruct such as have not given satisfaction to the elderpp [eldership] in point of knowledge.

5.—It is agreed that none shall be admitted to the Sacrament from congregations where eldershippes are constituted, except they bring a Testimoniall of their good life and conversation from the eldershipp they live under, to the eldershipp they come to receive under.

6.—That all that come to the Lord's Supper from other congregations, if they live within the same classis that the congregation is where they come to receive, they shall submitt to

examinacion by that elderpp they come to receive under, as the members of that congregation doe.

7.—That such as come to the Sacrament and live not within the classis where they come to receive, shall give satisfaccion to the elderpp of their knowledge and good life; otherwise are not to bee admitted.

8.—That the Lord's day next before the Sacramtt of the Lo. Supper, notice bee given to the congregacion that if any person take offence at any publique scandall given by any who intend to receive, they informing the eldershipp, the elderpp shall examine the same.

9.—Thursday, 4th March, 164$\frac{6}{7}$, preparation for ordination; Mr. Martindale, Mr. Holland, Mr. Clayton have offred themselves to be examin'd

10.—Mr. Hollinworth and Captn Ashton, ordered to goe to Preston to the meeting there,[1] Tewsday, 2o March, 164$\frac{6}{7}$.

[1] Hibbert-Ware has an account (*Foundations in Manchester*, i. 246) of a meeting in Preston, of November 17, 1646, which he calls the first meeting of the Provincial Assembly, and of which he abstracts the resolutions. It is doubtless a misnomer. The Provincial Assembly could not be constituted before the various classical assemblies from which it was drawn by delegation had been established, and the second, or Bury classis, did not hold its first meeting till the 25th of March, 1647. When regularly constituted the Provincial Assembly met half-yearly. But it will be found that up to the meeting of November 14, 1648, there is no observance of this rule or regularity. In the Bury and Manchester Minutes occur notices of meetings at Preston under the dates:

March 2, 1647.
May 4, 1647.
July 1, 1647.

At this last-mentioned, resolutions were passed which are preserved in the Bury Minutes, and signed by Edward Gee as scribe. But it is none the less certain that this was not a properly constituted Provincial Synod. In the first place, there is no record of the succeeding meeting. A further meeting had been fixed for the first Tuesday in September, 1647, but there is no account of any such meeting in either of the two existing classical Minute Books. In the second place, we have direct testimony of the exact date at which the Provincial Synod was actually constituted. Up to the present the meetings had apparently been only voluntary general meetings of

11.—The next classicall meeting to bee Tewsday, 16° March, next. Mr. Furnace to preach, Mr. Heyricke moderator.

12.—Exceptions tendred ag^tt James Parkinson (chosen ruling elder for Chorlton) by Nath. Taylor, who is to prove his exceptions at the next classis.

ministers in no constituted capacity. The order constituting the Synod was communicated in a letter from the first (Manchester) to the second (Bury) classis, which is entered in the minute book of the latter, under date 15th June, 1648. The order itself was as follows:

"May 22, 1648.

Att the Committee of Lords and Commons for Judgeinge of scandalls.

Ordered that the nyne classis of Lancashire shall be one province for that county and accordingly may act as a province.

A meeting was called in consequence by the first classis for Wednesday, the 5th of July, 1648, and a notice of this will be found in these minutes under the classis meeting of that date. There, an account was given that all those that appeared did agree that they may act provincially, and appoint time and place, etc."

Accordingly the first Provincial Synod was called for the 8th August, 1648, at Preston. The meeting was poorly attended (see below under date Sept. 5, 1648), and in consequence another meeting was fixed for the first Tuesday in October, 1648. But it was apparently postponed until the 14th of November following. It did at last meet on that day, and the preliminary synodical business not being concluded it was adjourned till February 7, $164\frac{8}{9}$. The continuous resolutions of these two meetings will be found below in these minutes under date. This was therefore in reality the first properly constituted and representative Synod of the province of Lancaster, and from this point onward the meetings will be found to be quite regularly held each half-year.

1649, May, September.
1650, June, November.
1651, May (adjourned), November.
1652, May, October.
1653, May, November.
1654, May, October.
1655, May, October.
1656, May, October.
1657, May, September.
1658, May, October.
1659, May, October (? The Manchester classis excused itself from sending delegates to this meeting because of the sad distractions of the time. See under Sept. 1659, *infra*. There can be little doubt, however, that the meeting was held).
1660, May.

13.—Warrants sent for Mr. Woolmer and Tho. Rudd[1] and his wife.

Richard Heyricke, moderator.

Moderator ended with prayer.

THE 2° MEETING at Manchester, March 16°, $164\frac{6}{7}$.

1.—Mr. Heyricke moderator begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregations deputed to this meeting :—

From Manchester : Richard Meare,[2] John Brownsword,[3]

[1] The cause of this citation is explained in the June and July meetings following. Thomas Rudd belonged to a family of Didsbury, where the name seems to have continued for centuries. He was churchwarden of Didsbury in 1642, and signs the protestation of February, $164\frac{1}{2}$ in that capacity. The will of Thomas Rudd, of Didsbury, chapman, was proved at Chester 1647. The Rudd of the text may have been a younger man.

[2] Richard Meare was a "chapman" of Manchester, and most active in municipal business and in the conduct of the classis. He was a subscriber (£1) to the Salford Chapel. His name occurs with great frequency in the Court Leet Records from 1631 onwards. The following are a few of the notices :—Oct., 1631, officer for the assize of bread ; Oct., 1633, scavenger ; Oct., 1635, market looker for corn. In 1647 he is noted as Ricardus Meare, generosus ; 1652, affairor of the court ; Oct., 1654, senior constable ; 1655, churchwarden ; 1657, overseer of the poor ; Oct., 1660, miselayer ; Oct., 1664, boroughreeve ; Oct., 1668, boroughreeve. He died in 1677, as is evident from Newcome (*Autob.*, 223), and the succession of his son, John Meare, "citizen of London," is noticed in Earwaker's *Manchester Court Leet Records*, vi. 73, under date April, 1679. He was a man of position. In the assessment of 1668 his name appears under the "Market Street and Shambles" district, and he is assessed 5*s.* 3*d.*, there being only eight larger sums in the whole list. He was a feoffee of various charities—Geo. Marshall's, 1646, Clarke's, 1657, &c. He was one of the electors of Newcome, 1656, and his name occurs with great frequency in the *Diary*. (For an account of his wife see M. C. L. R., iii. 288.)

[3] John Brownsword, "of Manchester, chapman," the fourth son of Thomas Brownsword, who died 1620 (M. C. L. R., iii. 30), was of Marketsted Lane in 1642. He married Cicely, daughter of Charles Worsley. Like the above, his name occurs with great frequency in the Leet Records—*e.g.*, Oct., 1623, scavenger ; 1624, misegatherer ; 1627, bylawman for Marketsted Lane, and so on quite regularly ; Oct.,

Rowland Wright,[1] Thomas Diconson.[2]
For Prestwich : Mr. Tobie Furnace, minister ; John Scoales,[3] Adam Gaskell,[4] James Smethurst,[5] James Taylor, elders.

1648, market looker for corn ; Oct., 1650, market looker for white meats. The last entry of his name is under Oct., 1652, but he appears in 1656 among the electors of Newcome, and a "Mr. Brownsword" is noticed in the *Diary* under date June 17, 1663. Administration of the goods of John Brownsword of Newton was granted in 1670 at the Chester Probate Court.

[1] Rowland Wright, "chapman" and "gentleman" of Manchester, son of a Richard Wright, of Preston Patrick, Westmorland. (*Palatine Note Book*, i. 214.) He was among the petitioners for and subscribers (£1) to Trinity Chapel, Salford, 1634, and signs the protestation of 1642 in the sixth division (Huntsbank, &c.). The first mention of his name in the M. C. L. R. is in Oct., 1648, when he occurs as market looker for white meats, 1650, officer for distributing the Collyhurst money, and so on. He was one of the electors of Newcome in 1656, and took the oath of allegiance to Charles II. in October, 1661. Administration of the estate of "Rowland Wright, Manchester," was granted in 1675 at the Chester Probate Court. For an account of his wife, see *Palatine Note Book*, iv. 29.

[2] Thomas Dickenson was probably the brother of Henry, the rich linen draper of Manchester, constable and borough reeve, &c. (*Vide* M. C. L. R., iii. iv. v. *passim* and vi. 168.) Thomas was apparently also a "chapman," of Salford, but in 1642 he signed the protestation in the fifth division (Deansgate). He was one of the electors of Newcome. The date of death is not known, unless he is the Thomas Dicconson, of Lancashire, whose will was proved in 1654 in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. A Thomas Dickinson appears as taking the oath of allegiance at Manchester, 14th May, 1679, but this may be Thomas, the son of the above-named Henry. Who was the Thomas Dickinson of Kirkby Hall mentioned in *Palatine Note Book*, iv. 29?

[3] John Scoles appears below (Dec., 1647) as husbandman, of Prestwich, forty-three years of age, with a son of the same name. He is described as of Hardman Fold, and was churchwarden in 1663. Two of the name appear among the protestors of Prestwich, 1642, and he may be the "John Scoles, of Prestwich," whose administration was granted at the Chester Court, 1671. There were, however, several others of the same name at Chadderton, in the same parish, who appear among the Oldham protestors, and whose wills appear at Chester, besides also divers John Scholes, of Manchester and Salford. (M. C. L. R., vol. iii. *passim*.)

[4] Adam Gaskell was resident in the hamlet of Heaton-up-Faughfield, in the parish of Prestwich, in 1642. No further mention of him occurs there. For an Adam Gaskell see Rose's *Historical Notes*, ii. 34 (indenture of 1659 relating to lands on West Leigh). The will of an Adam Gaskell of Lancashire was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury in 1656.

[5] James Smethurst occurs among the protestors of Unsworth-within-Pilkington, in the parish of Prestwich, in 1642. The will of James Smethurst of Unsworth was

For Flixton: Mr. Edw. Wilmore [Woolmer], minister; Peter Egerton,[1] Richard Cowper,[2] elders.

For Ashton-under-line: Mr. John Harison, minister; Robert Ashton, Thomas Walker,[3] Robert Lees,[4] Ottiwell

proved at Chester, 1695, but the date renders it improbable that it relates to the Smethurst of the text. Newcome mentions a visit to James Smethurst, Feb., 1686. (*Autob.*, p. 261.) There are at least two of the same name in the M. C. L. R. during the same period.

[1] Peter Egerton of Shaw Hall, Flixton, the Parliamentary colonel, commanded at the second siege of Lathom House. (See letters concerning this printed in *Local Gleanings*, vol. i.) In the ordinance for the Northern Association, 21 June, 1645 (L. J., vii. 445-447), he was nominated one of the commissioners for the collections for Lancashire, and one of the general head commissioners. On the sequestration of the rents of the Free School of Manchester he was named as one of the sequestrators. (C. J., ii. 806.) He was sheriff of the county in 1641. See various notices of him in *Civil War Tracts*, *Lanc. Lieut.*, *Hist. MSS. C. R.*, v. 47; *Thurlow*, iv. 473; *Cal. St. Pap.*. 1650, pp. 333, 521. In the *Palatine Note Book*, iii. 259, he is confounded with Major-General Egerton of the Parliament of 1662. This latter was Randolf Egerton of Betley, Chester. (See Rose's *Historical Notes*, ii. 110.) Administration of his estate was granted in 1656 in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. (See also Lanc. and Ches. Hist. Soc. for 1852.) His death was due to accidental poisoning. (Newcome *Autob.*, 79.)

[2] Richard Cowper appears in the Flixton register as guardian in 1637 and churchwarden in 1664; but the latter entry may refer to the son of the same name, who also appears in these minutes as an elder for Flixton. (July, 1647.) In the registers also occurs an entry:

Marriage, 1654. Richard Cowper of Urmston and Margret Owen of Flixton (Oct. 24).

Chester Wills—

Cowper, Richard, of Urmston, 1677.

Cowper, Richard, of Urmston, 1680.

Infra Wills—Cowper, Richard, of Urmston parish, Flixton, yeoman, 1664.

[3] In the assessment of 1618 a Thomas Walker appears as holding 12 acres Ashton Town "for William Cockers," 8 acres in Audenshaw, and 12 acres in Lusley. Thomas Walker occurs among the protestors of Ashton Town in 1642. The entry of his death occurs in the registers: "Aug. 29, 1670. Thomas Walker de Walkmillne." His will was proved at Chester, 1670, as of "Thomas Walker of Audenshawe."

[4] Robert Lees seems to have been a man of considerable possessions. In the assessment of 1618 a Robert Lees occurs as rated for 7 acres in Knott Lane, 15 acres in Smallshaw, 30 acres in Haslehurst. There are two entries relating to him in the Oldham registers: P. 133 (a daughter in 1636), p. 148 (a daughter in 1649). He married Margaret, third daughter of Ralph Hudson of Ardwick. (M. C. L. R., iii. 169.) He signs the protestation of 1642 in Ashton as a guardian. In the entry of his death

Andrew,[1] elders.

For Newton: Mr. Walker, minister; John Wright,[2] Thomas Baronn,[3] Peter Ashton,[4] elders.

For Eccles (Mr. Jones, minister, being sicke): Thomas Barlow, John Cliveley,[5] Tho. Edge,[6] elders.

3.—Accusations against James Parkinson,[7] prosecuted by Nathaniel Taylor:

in the register he is described as of Haslehurst: "27 Feb., 166$\frac{8}{9}$. Robert Lees de Haslehurst." His will was proved at Chester, 1668 (that is, 166$\frac{8}{9}$), as of "Robert Lees of Haslehurst parish, Ashton-under-Lyne, husbandman."

[1] Ottiwell Andrew occurs among the protestors of Lees, in Ashton parish, in 1642. His father of the same name is rated in the above-named assessment for land (10½ acres) in Haslehurst. The will of the father, Ottiwell Andrew of Alt, was proved at Chester 1641. There are two entries of the name in the Oldham registers, both probably relating to the son: P. 126 (a daughter, 1635), p. 144 (a daughter, 1638). There is also an entry concerning him in the Saddleworth register, p. 327. The will of the son was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury in 1655.

[2] John Wright was resident in Newton Heath in 164½, where he signs the protestation. The will of a John Wright of Lancashire was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury in 1653.

[3] Thomas Baron (Baronn, Beronn, Biron) was a chapman of Manchester, residing for some part of his life at Newton. He signs the protestation among the inhabitants of Newton Heath in 1642 as Thomas Barron. In the M. C. L. R. will be found mention of various purchases of land by him (v. 16, 49, 58). The notice of the succession of his son, "Benjamin Berron, clerk," to his estate occurs in the Leet Records, v. 215, where Mr. Earwaker has printed an extract from the will of the elder, dated 27th June, 1673, proved at Chester 20th June, 1674. His daughter, Esther, was married to Thomas Ellison, the son of the rector of Ashton. He left considerable legacies to the poor, and also to several ministers mentioned in these minutes. (See Newcome's *Diary*, 89.)

[4] Peter Ashton occurs among the protestors of Newton Heath in 1642, and appears as Peter Assheton taking the oath of allegiance 7th Oct., 1661. His son (?) Peter occurs as a protegé of John Angier and as of Pembroke Coll., Cambridge. (*Local Gl.*, ii. 88; Newcome's *Diary*, 80, 84.)

[5] John Clively (Cleveley, Cleeveley, Clefly) was both constable and churchwarden of Eccles in 1642. The will of John Cliveley of Newham, within Barton-upon-Irwell, was proved at Chester, 1663.

[6] Thomas Edge occurs among the inhabitants of Eccles in 1642. No further mention of him occurs, unless he is the Thomas Edge of Little Hulton, husbandman, whose will was proved at Chester, 1692. In the assessment of 1668 a Thomas Edge is named among the "outburgesses." (M. C. L. R., v. 258.)

[7] James Parkinson was of "Hardie," *i.e.*, Chorlton-cum-Hardy (M. C. L. R., iii. 276), and chosen elder for Chorlton.

(1) That hee is guilty of fornication, to prove which is produced the registre of Ashton de Mary [*sic* for Mersey] banke, [under] Mr. Stirrupes'[1] hand, of a daughter *genita ante nuptias*, also a sonne borne within 27 weekes after mariage. Thus far the reg^er^.

Willm. Thomas saith that hee caryed moneys for James Parkinson, 8*s.* 8*d.*, to the commissioners, but knowes not for what.

(2) To the accusation of slander, Wm. Hurlboat saith that James Parkinson said (coming by some works), This workes stands in much money, but it is noe matter; if ould Mr. Urion were living that hee (meaning Sir Wm. Brereton[2]) might rob him againe, as hee hath done twice—once at the choosing of knights for the shire, another time at goeing for New England.

Richard Taylor witnesseth the same thing.

(3) To the accusation of swearing, Tho. Blomiley saith hee heard him sweare and curse above two years since. Nathaniel Taylor saith he heard him sweare by his faith not within a yeare.

(4) To the accusation of violence, &c., James Chorlton saith hee cast a pott and a flagon at the face of another man (within a yeare), the said Parkinson being first call'd a knave.

[1] Ralph Stirrup was rector of Ashton-on-Mersey. (See Appendix.)

[2] Sir Wm. Brereton, the celebrated Parliamentary General of Cheshire. Born 1604; created a baronet 1627; died 1661. His name is of very frequent occurrence in the Journals of the Commons during the war. Walker (*Indep.*, i. 170) thus sums up what he had gained by the war: "Colonel-General of the Cheshire forces. Hath Cashoberry and other lands of Lord Capel's, worth £2,000 *p.a.*, and the archbishop's house and lands at Croyden, where he hath turned the chapel into a kitchen—a goodly reformation, and fits with his stomach as well as his religion." See also Earwaker's *East Cheshire*, vol. 1, for an account of him, his family, and his military successes, &c. The Chetham Society has long projected the publication of his Correspondence during the Civil War, from the original *MSS.* in the British Museum. It is to be regretted that it is not yet performed.

Thomas Bllomeley saith hee strucke his daughter.

(5) To the accusation of undue election Mr. Benson and Nathaniel Taylor objected.

Order'd that James Parkinson bring in his witnesses against the next classicall meeting.

4.—Mr. Jno. Hartley [1] demanded a copy of the whole charge against Mr. Tho. Smith, elder. Graunted that hee may have so much as concernes himselfe, either objection or answer.

5.—Agreed that the day for ordination of the expectants already examined bee April 15, 1647. Mr. Heyricke and Mr. Walker preach, Mr. Harison and Mr. Furnace pray.

6.—Petition exhibited by many of the congregation at Ouldham ag^tt^ Mr. Allen. By way of caution, orderd that if any petition be for Mr. Allen, those peticioners shall have notice.

7.—Petition exhibited by many of Stretford for one Hugh Newton to bee their minister. Hee is to come to the next meeting and bring certificates, &c., according to the ordinance.[2] In the meantime, hee is required to forbeare preaching.

[1] John Hartley, draper of Manchester. In Newcome's *Diary*, p. 33, will be found a long and instructive note on him. In one particular a correction is needed—the date of the purchase of Strangeways Hall by Hartley, which was about 1648, according to M. C. L. R., iv. 93. For an account of his descent see M. C. L. R., ii. 251, iii. 3 He was the second son and heir of Nicholas Hartley, borough reeve in 1590. He first occurs as an officer in the Court Leet in 1622, from which date his name is not absent for a single year—1623, sealer of leather; 1624, market looker for corn, and so on; 1629, constable; 1630, borough reeve. There is a curious account in these Leet Records of a dispute as to the right of precedence in drawing water at the conduit, Mr. Hartley claiming it as incident to his property. For an account of his marriages see Mr. Earwaker's note, M. C. L. R., iv. 291. His will is dated 1655, and was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 26th November, 1655. See also Commons Journals, iii. 625.

[2] The ordinance for ordination of ministers had at first been only of a temporary and provisional character. It was introduced in the Commons in pursuance of "divers propositions concerning the doctrinal and directory part of ordination" presented from the Assembly on the 20th April, 1644. (C. J., iii. 466.) The form of the ordinance is printed under date 14th August, 1644, as it was reported from committee (C. J., iii. 589), and in this form of it the scheme was simply that of a body of

8.—Agreed that the next classicall meeting bee April 14°, 1647. Mr. Heyricke moderator.

9.—Papers read concerning Mr. Walker and the congregation at Newton. Debated ; put to the question, whether wee shall approve of Mr. Walker's removall from the congregation of Newton. Concluded negatively.

10.—Resolved, that all that preach within the classis and are not members of the classis be called to give account of their call to the office of preaching.

11.—Resolved, that all ministers or others permitting men to preach within the classis bee accountable for those whom they permitt.

12.—Resolved, that if an elder heare privately of a scandall committed by a communicant hee ought to goe to the party

twenty-three commissioners sitting in London, with power to ordain any who came before them, being fit, but only as a temporary commission (the Lords limited the duration of it to one year), until the Presbyterian system could be established over the country. This was accepted by the Lords on the 30th September, 1644, and ordered to be printed by the Commons on the 2nd October. (L. J., vii. 3.) A year later, when this ordinance had lapsed, and when the state of the Church favoured a more general and decentralised system, an ordinance was brought in for the ordaining of presbyters by presbyteries generally. (22nd October, 1645, C. J., iv. 317.) It passed the Commons the same day without being committed, with a proviso that it should stand in force for twelve months only. It passed the Lords on the 8th November. (L. J., vii. 659, 675, 682.) A copy of it is entered in the Journals, vii. 683. In the rules for procedure it does not differ from the ordinance of the previous year. In both, Rule 1 runs thus : "He that is to be ordained must address himself to the presbytery, and bring with him a testimony of his taking the Covenant of the three kingdoms, of his diligence and proficiency in his studies, what degrees he hath taken in the university, and what hath been the time of his abode there, and withal of his age, which is to be twenty-four years at least, but especially of his life and conversation."

It was later resolved to make the ordinance indefinite in time. (L. J., viii. 320.) On the 31st July the Commons ordered Mr. Harrington and Mr. Rowse to prepare such an ordinance. It was introduced on the 27th August, 1646, and passed the same day without commitment, and sent up. (C. J., iv. 630, 653.) It was passed in the Lords on the following day (L. J., viii. 474), but is not entered in the Journals. It was merely a repetition of the previous order without the proviso of limitation of time.

accused, and if hee deny the thing the elder shall bring the matter to the eldership.

13.—Resol^d, that every congregationall eldership shall advise with the classis concerning the manner of representing scandalls, not enumerated, to the committee [1] before they doe so represent them, that the com^tee may not bee needlessly troubled.

Moderator ended with prayer.

[1] The ordinance for the suspension of the ignorant and scandalous from the Sacrament had given rise to serious differences between the Parliament and the Assembly of Divines. The Commons were determined to restrict the action of the presbytery in suspension to a specified list of offences. Against this restriction the clerical mind revolted. The dispute was settled, by way of compromise, by the appointment of the committee in question, although it amounted in reality to a denial of the freedom of censorial activity which was claimed by what by this time may be correctly styled the "Presbyterian" clergy. In consequence of petitions from the Assembly and from the London clergy in March, $164\frac{4}{5}$, the Lords drew up an ordinance of suspension. (March 10, L. J., vii. 267.) The Commons sat on this ordinance on the 21st March, and resolved "to refer it to the Assembly to express the particulars of that ignorance and scandal" which they conceive fit cause for exclusion. This was presented from the Assembly four days later, and the House then settled down to consider the list methodically. The discussion occupied almost six months. It did not pass the Commons as an ordinance until the 15th October, 1645 (C. J., iv. 308), when it was sent up to the Lords. This first ordinance contained two qualifying clauses: (1) "and not otherwise until it be otherwise declared by both Houses of Parliament;" (2) "that no notoriously scandalous other than such as are herein expressed shall be suspended from the Lord's Supper." This ordinance passed the Lords on the 20th October following, and is printed in the Journals. (L. J., vii. 649.)

Naturally, the limitations contained in the ordinance gave dissatisfaction to the clergy, and on the 12th November, 1645, the Assembly presented its "humble advice concerning more particulars of scandals," being supported by a petition from the Common Council and from the ministers of London. In consequence, further resolutions (fifteen in number) as to suspension were adopted by the Commons, considerably extending the previous list of offences, &c. (21st January, $164\frac{5}{6}$), and these were drawn up into a *second* ordinance, which passed the Commons on the 5th March. (C. J., iv. 412, 455, 463.) On the 13th the Lords agreed to it, with certain alterations, which were accepted by the Commons, and on the 14th it was ordered to be printed. (L. J., viii. 208; C. J., iv. 475.) Article xiv. of this ordinance ran as follows:—

> "That in every province persons shall be chosen by the Houses of Parliament that shall be commissioners to judge of scandalous offences (not enumerated in any ordinance of Parliament) to them presented, and that the eldership of that congregation where the

THE 3rd MEETING at Manchester, April 14°, 1647.

1.—Mr. Heyricke being sicke, Mr. Furnace, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationes deputed to this meeting :—

From Manchester : Rich. Haworth,[1] Raph Bridocke, Robert Bradshaw,[2] Tho. Smith, elders.

> said offence was committed shall, upon examination and proof of such scandalous offence, . . . certify the same to the commissioners . . . and if the said commissioners, after examination of all parties, shall determine the offence so presented and proved to be scandalous, and the same shall certify to the congregation, the eldership thereof may suspend any such person," &c.

Naturally, such a scheme of lay-appointed commissioners was most repugnant to clerical feeling, and a week later the Assembly presented to the Parliament a petition which so incensed the Commons that after long debates it was voted a breach of privilege, 11th April, 1646. (L. J., viii. 232 ; C. J., iv. 506.) By way of compromise, the Commons, however, determined to consider of a further enumeration of scandalous offences (18th May, 1646), and on the 23rd a scheme was proposed in the following terms as "an expedient instead of the commissioners appointed" in the second ordinance above-named :—

> " If any scandalous sin not enumerated be committed, and so determined to be by the eldership, the said eldership shall certify the cause and the proofs to *the Committee of Parliament at Westminster*, who shall forthwith determine the same," &c.

This is the committee referred to in the text.

This was ordered to be drawn up into an ordinance, which is therefore No. 3 of these ordinances. It passed the Commons on the 3rd June and the Lords on the 5th June, 1646 (C. J., iv. 562 ; L. J., vii. 358), with the title "An Ordinance for giving Further Power for the Keeping . . . from the Sacrament," &c. The list of the committee appears to include all the then sitting members of the House, "or any nine of them." Its constitution and aspect and temperament was lay. (This ordinance was to continue in force for three years.)

[1] Richard Haworth, counsellor-at-law and bachelor of Gray's, practising in Manchester. Born 1598, died 1671. A sufficient account of him will be found in Mr. Bailey's note, *Palatine Note Book*, i. 168, and Mr. Earwaker's *Manchester Court Leet Records*, iv. 73, v. 192. He occurs in many registers of this district as signing marriage entries of the Commonwealth period as a justice of peace. He had a large estate in Manchester through his first wife (in the assessment of 1668 his amount is 10*s.* 6*d.*, there being only two larger in the whole town), but held no offices in connection with the Leet.

[2] Identity uncertain. At least two of the name appear in the Leet Records, the one a baker the other a webster, the latter appearing for the first time in 1629. Mr.

For Prestwich: Mr. Tobie Furnace, minister, prædict.; James Wroe, James Tayler, elders.

For Flixton: Ed. Wilmore, minister; Tho. Walkden,[1] Richard Rogers,[2] elders.

For Eccles (Mr. Jones being sicke): Richard Edge,[3] Tho. Filds, Robert Barlow.[4]

For Ashton-under-Line: Mr. John Harison, minister; Capt. Ro. Ashton, Ca. Sandiford,[5] Tho. Walker, elders.

For Chorlton: Mr. Benson, minister; Tho. Chorlton, John Barlow,[6] elders.

For Newton: Mr. Willm. Walker, minister; John Wright, Peter Ashton, elders.

3.—Order'd, that those who are absent from this meeting (who were deputed) shall at the next meeting give account of their not appearing.

Bailey identifies him with the Robert Bradshaw who signed the protestation in the sixth division of Manchester. (*Palatine Note Book*, i. 214.) The death of Mr. Robert Bradshaw of the Milngate is noticed in the October Leet, 1669. (M. C. L. R., v. 94, where see Mr. Earwaker's note.) This was probably the Robert Bradshaw, "webster."

[1] Thos. Walkden signs the protestation among the inhabitants of Flixton as Thomas Walkeden. The will of Thomas Walkden of Flixton, "yeoman," was proved at Chester 1665. His son of the same name was of Jesus Coll., Camb.

[2] Richard Rogers, a "yeoman" of Flixton, also occurs among the inhabitants of Flixton in 1642. His will was proved at Chester 1663.

[3] A Richard Edge occurs among the inhabitants of Eccles in 1642. He is distinct from the Thomas Edge *(supra)*.

[4] Robert Barlow may be a clerical error for Thomas Barlow (*supra*).

[5] Captain Sandiford. John, the son of Robert of High Ashes, of Ashton-under-Lyne. (Baines, ii. 338.) In the "fifteenth book" (assessment of 1618) John Sandford is rated on not less than 160 acres in Ashton town, Audenshaw, Woodhouses, Knott Lanes, Lees, and Mossley. (Glover's *Ashton*, 363–8.) There are three notices of him in the Oldham Registers: P. 111 (daughter, 1633), p. 118 (son, Robert, 1634), p. 123 (burial of wife, 24th Nov., 1634). The inventory of John Sandiford of Higher Ashes was proved at Chester 1661, but in the Ashton Registers there is an entry of death: "4 June, 1675. John Sandiford de High Ashes, gent." It may be that this is the second son of the captain. The first son, Samuel, is often mentioned in Newcome's *Diary*.

[6] John Barlow was resident in "Hardy" in 1642. There is quite a score of the name in the local transactions of the period, with a bewildering variety of avocations—yeomen, butchers, attorneys, joiners, &c.

4.—Captaine Sa. Birch,[1] junior, desired and allowed register of this classis at a former meeting of the classis.

5.—James Parkinsones witnesses (for himselfe) produced.

George Scoales, exam^d^, saith that hee knoweth not that ever the said Parkinson had any child by the said woman (whereof he is accused) before marriage: that shee lived neere to him afterwards. James Parkinson confesseth that the child was borne upon New Yeares Day, about eight weekes before time.

James Chorlton and John Barlow, elders of Chorlton, were deputed by the classis to examine Ellen Hurleboate (not able to come to the classis) concerning a sonne borne to the said Parkinson upon the said New Yeares Day: that it was borne without haire or nayles: that she conceived it was borne before time.

Jane Jones, ex^ed^, saith that shee saw the said child within a day that it was borne, and that it was very weake, could not sucke of about eight weeks, and she beleiveth that it was borne about eight weekes before time.

Wm. Arstall (to the matter of slander) saithe that hee was present when the said Parkinson spoke some words concerning Sir Wm. Brereton, which were these, that Sir William Brereton could not have all, for (if it were true that Grantham said) one trunke was gone to New England, an other was gone at the shouting: that one of the witnesses that went to complaine to [Sir] Willm. Brereton was in drinke when hee went.

Margery Knight, examined ag^tt^ James Parkinson, saith that the said woman w^th^ which the said Parkinson was accus'd (whose name was Joane Jones) was mother to this examinat, and at nineteene yeares of this examinates age tould her that

[1] Captain Samuel Birch, junior (see *postea*, meeting of Sept., 1647). The second son of old Captain Samuel, who appears later as an elder for Gorton. Generally known as "Major" Birch of Ardwick. Baptised at Coll. Ch. Feb. 18, 1620; buried at Gorton July 8, 1693. The brother of the better known Colonel John Birch. (See C. J., iv. 63, 131.) He is several times mentioned in the Leet Records (vol. iv.) as possessing what must have been rare—"brick buildings" in the Deansgate.

the said Parkinson had held her handes behind her and had abus'd her : that shee very often complayn'd of this Parkinson for the said fact : that the said Parkinsons father reported her to bee with child presently after.

6.—Divers of the congregation of Salford petition'd ag^tt^ Mr. Allen. Agreed, that nothing shall bee done by this classis in relation to Mr. Allene's being minister at Salford without notice first given to that congregation of Salford, and that this classis doth not approve of his present officiating there.

7.—Next meeting to bee upon this day month, viz., May 12°, 1647 ; Mr. Angier moderator.

Mr. Furnace and Mr. Hyde[1] to bee sent to the meeting at Preston, May 4° next.

8.—Warrantes orderd to bee sent out for Mr. Hall,[2] Mr. Briggs, Mr. Wigan, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Hopwood.

[1] Colonel Robert Hyde of Denton, justice of the peace, elder for Denton. Born 1604, died April 4, 1684 (Dukinfield reg.). For his descent see St. George's Visitation, 1613. It was he who brought John Angier from Ringley to Denton, and he played an active part in the war at the siege of Manchester and Lathom House. (*Local Gleanings*, i. 5, 11. See also *Civil War Tracts*, *Lanc. Lieut.*, &c. ; also C. J., iii. 349.) His family was, like himself, very strict in its Puritanism.

[2] For the names mentioned in Minute 8 see list of ministers.

ORDINACION[1] BY THE PRESBYTERS OF THE FIRST CLASSIS IN THE COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER OF SEVEN EXPECTANTS, VIZ., MR. THO. CLAYTON, MR. THO. HOLLAND, MR. NEHEMIAH POTT, MR. HEN. VAUGHAN, MR. JNO. MALDEN, MR. JNO. WORTHINGTON, MR. JNO. BRIDGES.

Preparation thereunto (according to ordinance of Parliament[tt]) begunne March 4°, 1646.

Mr. Tho. Clayton, aged above 24 yeares, M[r] of Artes, of S[tt] Johns: brought certificate of his good conversation from Blackburne, where he was borne, tooke the Nationall Covenant before the classis: desired and freely elected by the people of Didsbury, in this county of Lancast[r]: was examined according to the ordinance. An instrument[1] affixed on the church doore of the said congregation. Answer ret. without exception. His question in divinity, *an gratia dei sit irresistibilis?* His deff. affirm. [his defendendis affirmative] approv'd, and the 15th of April, 1647, ordayn'd. See the file.

Mr. Thomas Holland, aged about 24 yeares, brought certificate of his being M[r] of Arts in the University of Edinburgh, and of his progresse in philosophy and divinity, and his good conversation there: hath taken the Nationall Covenant. Desired and elected by the people of Ringley, in com. Lanc. Recommended by them to the classis. Was examined according to the ordinance and approv'd. His instrument affixed to the

[1] All the details of these ordinations will be found in exact accordance with the ordinance of November, 1645 (see note 2, p. 26). After presentation of certificates the applicant was to be examined as to knowledge and gifts in preaching, then to be sent to his intended church to preach three days, on the last of which there was to be sent to the congregation from the classis an instrument to be read in the congregation and then affixed to the church, inviting notification of all exceptions against the applicant. This is known as the *si quis*. The actual manner of ordination is then minutely prescribed, and will be found to be exactly followed in the practice of the classis.

chappell doore at Ringley return'd without exception. His quest[n], *an fides justificans potest amitti?* His neg. deff. [his negative defendendis] approvd, ordaynd, cum ceteris.

Mr. Nehemiah Pott, aged above 24 yeares, brought certificate of his abilityes and holy life from divers ministers in Cheshire: tooke the Nationall Covenant before the classis: brought l[res] in his comendacion from Mr. Langley. Was desired and elected by the people of Swettenham, in Cheshire. Was fully examined according to the ordinance, and gave good satisfaction, noe exception brought ag[tt] him. His quest[ion], *an Christus sit mortuus pro omnibus et singulis hominibus?* His neg. deff. approv'd, was ordayn'd, ut supra.

Mr. Henry Vaughan, aged almost 30 yeares, was four yeares at the University of Oxford: tooke not his degree because of the Kinges coming thither: brought a full certificate & approbacion from the committee of Salop, another full certificate from the ministers at Salop. Desired and freely elected by the people of Moreton Sey, in the said county of Salop. Tooke the Nationall Covenant before the classis. Was examined according to the ordinance and approv'd: gave good satisfaccion, noe exception brought ag[tt] him. His quest[n], *an sit regimen ecclesiasticum jure divino?* His neg. deff. approv'd: was ordayn'd, ut supra.

Mr. John Malden, aged about 24 yeares, was four yeares at the University of Oxford: tooke not his degree because of the Kinge's coming thither: brought an approbacion from the committee of Salop for his place, and a certificate from the ministers at Salop. Desired and elected by the people at Cheswardine, in the said county of Salop. Tooke the Nationall Covenant before the classis. Was examined fully according to the ordinance, wherein he gave good satisfacion: Upon the return of his instrument (affixed to the church doore at Cheswardine), noe exception brought in. His quest[ion], *an detur appelatio jure divino a particulari ecclesia ad classes et synodos?* His affirm. deff. approv'd: was ordayn'd, cum ceteris.

Mr. John Worthington, aged about 27 yeares, Bachelor of Arts of Catherine Hall, Camb., brought testimoniall from the congregation at Denton, where he had preacht a yeare: hath taken the Nationall Covenant. Desired by the congregation at Ouldham. Was examined according to the ordinance and gave satisfaction: noe exception brought against him. His quest[ion], *an sola fides justificat?* His affirm. deff. approv'd: ordayn'd, ut in ceteris.

Mr. John Bridges brought certificate of his age, about 25 yeares: brought certificate of his taking the Nationall Covenant, another certificate of his proficiency in learning and holiness in life from the Yorkshire ministers. Elected and much desired by the people at Sheffield, in Yorkshire. Was fully examined according to the ordinance: hee gave competent satisfacion. His instrument (affixed to the doore of Sheffield church) return'd without exception. His quest[ion], *an lex moralis sit abrogata?* His neg. deff. aprov'd: ordayn'd, ut in cæteris.

Upon the 15th day of April, 1647, being appointed a fast for this present businesse, Mr. Walker preacht. The aforesaid expectants haveinge made publique confession of their faith in the congregation at Manchester, according to the ordinance, with earnest prayer they were very solemnly sett apart for the worke of the ministry by imposition of hands, and afterwardes had such instruments of testimoniall as these deliver'd to each of them, thus signed:

Apud Manchester,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. Thomas Clayton, M^r^ of Artes, aged about twenty-eight yeares, hath addressed himselfe unto us, authorised by ordinance of both Houses of Parliam^tt^ of the 26 August, 1646, for the ordination of ministers, desireing to be ordayn'd a presbyter, for that hee is chosen and appointed for the worke of the ministry in the church of Didsbury, in the county of Lancaster, as by a certificate now remaining with us, touching that his

election and appointment appeareth, and hee having likewise taken the Nationall Covenant before us and exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his diligence and proficiency in his studyes and unblameablenesse of life and conversation, hee hath beene examined according to the rules for examination in the said ordinance expressed and thereupon approved, and there haveing been noe just exception made against his ordination and admission, these may testify to all whom it may concerne that upon the fifteenth day of this month of April wee have proceeded solemnly to sett him apart to the office of a presbyter and worke of the ministry of the gospell by the laying on of our hands, by fasting, and prayer, by virtue whereof wee doe declare him to bee a lawfull and sufficiently authorised minister of Jesus Christ; and haveing good evidence of his lawfull and fayre calling not only to the worke of the ministry but to the exercise thereof in the church of Didsbury, in the county aforesaid, wee doe hereby send him thither and actually admitt him to the said charge, to performe all the offices and dutyes of a faithfull pastor there: exhorting the people, in the name of Jesus Christ, willingly to receive and acknowledge him as the minister of Christ, and to maintaine and encourage him in the execution of his office, that hee may bee able to give up such an account to Christ of their obedience to his ministry as may bee to his joy and their everlasting comfort. In witnesse whereof wee, the presbyters of the first classis in the county of Lancaster, have hereto sett our handes this fifteenth day of April, anno dni. 1647.

Rich. Heyricke. Edward Woolmer.
John Harison. Will. Walker.
Tobie Furnes.

The other six had the like instruments (and so subscribed) verbatim, except only such difference as hereafter followeth:

Apud Manch^{r},
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. Tho^{s} Holland, M^{r} of Arts, aged about twenty-fo ureayres, hath addressed himselfe etc. . . to the worke of the

ministry in the church of Ringley, in the county of Lancaster, as by etc. . . . and hee haveing taken the Nationall Covenant and exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his diligence etc. . . . that upon the 15th day of this month of April wee etc. . . . in the church of Ringley, in the county aforesaid. In witnesse whereof wee, the presbyters of the first classis in the county of Lancaster, have hereto sett our hands this 15 day of April, anno dni. 1647.

Rich. Heyricke. Ed. Woolmer.
John Harison. Will. Walker.
Tobie Furnes.

Apud Manch^r^,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. Nehemiah Pott, aged above twentie-four yeares, hath addressed himselfe etc. . . . in the church of Swettenham, in the county of Chester, as etc. . . . and having likewise taken the Nationall Covenant before us, and exhibited a sufficient testimonial of his diligence etc. . . . that upon the 15th day of this month of April wee etc. . . . in the church of Swettenham, in the etc. . . . In witnesse whereof wee, the presbyters of the first etc. . . .

Rich. Heyricke. Edward Woolmer.
Will. Walker. John Harison.
Tobie Furnes.

Apud Manchester,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. Henry Vaughan, aged almost 30 yeares, hath addressed himselfe etc. . . . in the church of Moreton Sey, in the county of Salop etc. . . . and hee haveing likewise taken the Nationall Covenant before us, and exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his diligence etc. . . . that upon the 15th day of this month of April wee etc. . . . in the church of Moreton Sey, in etc. . . . In witnesse whereof wee, the presbyters of the first etc. . . .

Rich. Heyricke. Tobie Furnes.
John Harison. Edward Woolmer.
Wm. Walker.

Apud Manchester,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. John Malden, aged above twenty-four yeares, hath addressed etc. . . . in the church of Chiswardine, in the county of Salop etc. . . . and hee haveing likewise taken the Nationall Covenant before us, and exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his diligence etc. . . . that upon the 15th day of this month of April wee etc. . . . in the church of Chiswardine, in etc. . . . In witnesse whereof wee, the presbyters of the first classis etc. . . .

Rich. Heyricke. Edward Woolmer.
John Harrison. Tobie Furnes. Will. Walker.

Apud Manchester,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. John Worthington, Bachelor of Artes, aged about 27 yeares, hath etc. . . . for that hee is chosen and appointed for the worke of the ministry in the church of Ouldam, in the county of Lancaster, as etc. . . . and hee haveing likewise taken the Nationall Covenant, and exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his diligence etc. . . . that upon the 15th day of this month of April etc. . . . and haveing evidence of his lawfull calling not only to the work of the ministry, but to the exercise thereof in the church of Ouldam, in the etc. . . . In witnesse etc. . . .

Rich. Heyricke. Edward Woolmer.
John Harison. Will. Walker.
Tobie Furnes.

Apud Manchest^{r},
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. John Bridges, aged about 25 yeares, hath addressed himselfe unto us, authorised by an ordinance of both Houses of Parliament of the 26 Aug., 1646, for the ordination of ministers, desireing to bee ordayn'd a presbyter, for that hee is chosen and appointed for the worke of the ministry in the church of Sheffield, in the county of Yorke, as by a certificate

now remaining with us, touching that his elecion and appointm^{tt} appeareth ; and hee haveing likewise exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his taking the Nationall Covenant, his diligence and proficiency in his studyes, and unblameablenesse of life and conversation, hee hath been ex^{ed} according to the rules for examintion. in the said ordinance expressed, and thereupon approv'd ; & there haveing been noe exception made ag^{tt} his ordination and admission, these may testify to all whom it may concerne that upon the 15th day of this month of April wee have proceeded solemnly to sett him apart to the office of a presbyter & worke of the ministry of the gospell, by laying on of our hands, with fasting & prayer ; by virtue whereof wee doe declare him to bee a lawfull and sufficiently authorised minister of Jesus Christ ; and having good evidence of his lawfull and fayre calling, not only to the work of the ministry, but to the exercise thereof in the church of Sheffield, in the aforesaid county, wee doe hereby send him etc. . . . (ut in prim. examp.). In witnesse whereof wee, the presbyters of the first classis in the county of Lancaster, have hereto sett our hands this 15th day of April, anno domini 1647.

Rich. Heyricke. Edward Woolmer. John Harison.
Wm. Walker. Tobie Furnes.

THE 4th MEETING at Manchester, May 12, 1647.

1.—Mr. John Angier, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting :—

For Manchester: Mr. Rich. Heyricke, warden ; Rich. Meare, Row. Wright, Raph Bridocke, elders.

For Eccles (Mr. Jones, minister, yett sicke) : Tho. Rogers, Tho. Warburton, Wm. Smith, elders.

For Prestwich : Mr. Toby Furnes, minister ; Peter Sergeant, James Wroe, Ja. Smethurst, elders.

For Flixton : Mr. Edw. Woolmer, minister ; Richard Cowper, Richard Rogers, elders.

For Ashton-under-line : Mr. Jno. Harison, minister ; Captaine Ashton, Robt. Leech, Hugh Taylor,[1] elders.

For Chollerton : Mr. Richard Benson, minister ; John Barlow, Edward Chorlton, elders.

For Newton : Mr. Willm. Walker, minister ; John Wright, Tho. Baron, Peter Ashton, elders.

For Denton : Mr. John Angier, minister ; Robt. Hyde and Willm. Booth,[2] elders.

3.—James Parkinson produced witnesse for himselfe.

Raph Barlow, of Ashton-de-Marcy Banke, examined, saith that Joane Warburton, afterwards Joane Jones, was a light woman of her love both before mariage, in that state, and in her widowhood : that some

[1] Hugh Taylor was one of the two constables of the parish of Ashton in 1642. Probably the son of the John Taylor who was assessed in 1618 for 26 acres and 2¼ of common at Hartshead. (Glover, 366.) His will was proved at Chester, 1667 : "Hugh Taylor of Hartshead, parish Ashton-under-Lyne, yeoman." There were many of the name about Alt.

[2] William Booth was resident in Reddish in 1642. The will of William Booth of Reddish was proved at Chester in 1675. Later in the minutes he appears as Captain Wm. Booth ; but the Captain Booth generally known (*e.g.*, Newcome's *Diary*, 184) was Captain John Booth, of the siege of Manchester, and afterwards colonel.

discourse passing (during the time of her widowhood) betwixt the said Widow Jones and the said James Parkinson, being desired by the said Parkinson, this examinat was present, when the said Widow Joanes denyed that ever shee had reported of the said James Parkinson evell behind his backe: that the said Parkinson desired hee might have her good report, and shee should have his.

4.—Question being debated in this classis whether the 4th branch [1] of the ordinance of the 14th of March, 164$\frac{5}{6}$, limiting

[1] The ordinance referred to is the "Ordinance for Church Government," which passed the Commons on the 5th of March, 164$\frac{5}{6}$ (C. J., iv. 463); agreed to by the Lords on the 14th, with some alterations (L. J., viii. 209). It is not to be found in Scobell, but is printed in the Commons Journals.

Branch IV. of the ordinance ran as follows:—

"That the tryers of Elections of Elders shall have power to receive, hear, and determine all exceptions brought in to them concerning undue elections, and to that end to call before them all such persons so elected and accepting such election, and to send for such witnesses as shall be nominated unto them by such persons as shall bring in such exceptions: And shall have power to examine upon oath both the persons bringing in such exceptions and the said witnesses concerning any undue proceedings in the manner of the said election, and concerning all matters of ignorance or scandal objected against the party elected, and expressed in any ordinance of Parliament to be a sufficient cause of suspension from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and of which any eldership by any ordinance of Parliament hath cognizance and jurisdiction, and that shall be proved to have been committed *within one whole year before the exceptions exhibited*: And that the persons against whom the exceptions are shall have like liberty to produce witnesses to be examined in like manner on their behalf."

Branch V.:

"That the tryers shall have power to examine whether the elders that are to be chosen be so qualified as is expressed in the ordinance for directions which hath passed both Houses."

The decision of the classis was entirely according to reason. The limitation to one year concerned only the inquisition into conduct for the purpose of an actual process before the class and a regular infliction of penalty in the shape of suspension; whereas the case in point was not the trial and suspension of an elder, but only a decision as to his moral fitness for the post and duty of elder before the approval of him by the classis.

The debate had reference to the case of Parkinson, under trial for fitness as an elder for Chorlton.

The ordinance of Aug. 19, 1645, is the ordinance for the "Directions for the Election of Elders." It is printed in the Lords Journal, vii. 544, under date. The

scandall to that which hath beene given within twelve months before, doe take away the liberty of examining "whether the elders bee men of good understanding in matters of religion, sound in the faith, prudent, discreete, grave, and of unblameable conversation, and willing to undergoe the said office" as by the direcions of both Houses, die Martis 19 Aug., 1645, beyond the time or noe? considering the 5th braunch of the said ordinance of 14th of March, 1645, viz., that the triers shall have power to examine whether the elders that are to bee chosen bee so qualifyed as is expressed in the ordinance of direccions wch. hath passed both Houses. Resolved negatively.

6.—Question upon the prooffe of such part of the severall charges ag^tt^ James Parkinson as is made already, whether the said James Parkinson is to bee judg'd fitt in point of qualification (according to the ordinance) to bee a ruling elder at Chourlton. Resolved in the negative.

7. — Petition brought in by Capt^n^ Geo. Cranage,[1] Tho. Woolfenden,[2] and Phillip Stampe,[3] part of the congregation of Salford: attested by them to bee really subscribed as is pretended.

words in inverted commas in the text are quoted from it, but not quite verbatim. These directions contained no such limitation of time to one year previously:

> "It shall be lawful for the congregations respectively, or any other person, to exhibit exceptions against any person elected as aforesaid, touching the right of his election or touching matter of ignorance or scandal hereafter mentioned, within fourteen days next after the said election."

[1] Captain George Cranage of Salford. (See Mr. Bailey's note in *Palatine Note Book*, iv. 109.) He organised volunteers for the assistance of Manchester in 1642, and later brought charges against Henry Wrigley for his conduct on that occasion. He was one of the petitioners for the Salford Church, and subscribed to it. His will was proved in London, 1655.

[2] Thos. Wolfenden, constable of Salford, 1641, signs the protestation in the following year as Thos. Woofindin (see *Palatine Note Book*, iv. 108), "a large tradesman and a man of property," but does not occur in the M. C. L. R. His will was proved at Chester in 1668.

[3] Philip Stampe occurs later as elder for Salford. There are three of the same name in the M. C. L. R., one of whom signs the elections indentures of Worsley and Radcliffe, and was churchwarden in 1654 and overseer in 1660 and 1664, having a s of the same name. A linen draper. (See Mr. Bailey's note in *Palatine Note Book*, iv. 107.) The will of Philip Stamp of Manchester was proved at Chester in 1677.

8.—The petition of Newton about Mr. Walker presented: asserted by Mr. Walker, and the elders of this meeting deputed, to be truly subscribed. The agreement betwixt the said Mr. Walker and the people consented unto and acknowledged on both sides.

9.—Upon the warrant sent out to the expectants Mr. Hall & Mr. Briggs appear'd. Mr. Angier, Mr. Harrison, Capt. Wm. Booth, and Robert Leech order'd to deale with Mr. Wigan privately, to labour to satisfy his doubts of coming to the classis befor the next meeting of the classis.

10.—The next meeting of the classis to bee upon Wednesday, the ninth of June, 1647. All the expectants are then appointed to come to begin their examinaciones in reference to ordination. Mr. Heyricke moderator.

Ended with prayer.

THE 5th MEETING at Manchester, June 9th, 1647.

1.—Mr. Heyricke, warden, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregations deputed to this meeting:—

For Manchester: John Brownsword, Thomas Smith, Robt. Bradshaw, Tho. Diconson, elders.

For Prestwich: Mr. Toby Furnes, minister; Peter Sergeant, James Wroe, James Taylor, elders.

For Eccles (Mr. Jones, minister, being sicke): John Clefley, Richard Edge, & Tho. Barlow, elders.

For Flixton: Mr. Edw. Woolmer, minister; Peter Egerton, Esq., Tho. Walkden, elders.

For Ashton-under-Line: Jno. Harison, minister; Isaac Dehow,[1] Lawrance Wright,[2] Jno. Thorpe,[3] elders.

For Denton: Mr. Jno. Angier, minister; Robt. Hyde, Esq., William Booth, elders.

For Newton: Mr. Wm. Walker, minister; Thomas Baronn, Jno. Wright (excusd), elders.

For Chollerton: Mr. Rich. Benson, minister; John Barlow, James Chollerton, elders.

3.—Mr. Adam Martindale being dealt with by some members of this classis, hath received satisfaction, as by these following particulars[4] may appeare:

[1] Isaac Dehowe. (See Mr. Earwaker's note in *Manchester Court Leet Records*, iii. 272.) Son of a glassmaker of Glasshouse, Haughton, near Hyde. For a discussion on the glass trade there, see Cheshire *Notes and Queries*, also Stockport registers, pp. 64 and 103. The father, also called Isaac, must have been well-to-do, as in 1618 he owned 31 acres in Ashton. The son Isaac was baptised at Stockport 20th December, 1622. In the list of protestors Isaac Dehowe appears under Knott Lanes and Parke. The entry of his burial occurs in the Ashton registers: "8 June, 1666, Mr. Isaac Dehowe de Bardsley."

[2] Lawrance Wright was of "Knott Lanes and Parke" in 1642, signing the protestation as supervisor pauperum. It seems probable that he is the son of Lawrance Wright of Stockport, the notice of whose marriage occurs in the registers there, p. 32, 1595, where see Mr. Bulkeley's note. Lawrance Wright (the father, probably) appears as owning 33 acres in Knott Lanes, Ashton, in 1618. "167$\frac{2}{3}$. January, Lawrance Wright de Parke dyed att Denham" (Ashton register).

[3] John Thorpe, of "Ashton towne," in 1642. In 1618 a John Thorpe held 17 acres in Ashton town. In the Oldham registers, p. 128 (26th March, 1635), there is an entry of the burial of the wife of John Thorp, of the parish of Ashton. The will of John Thorpe was proved at London, 1658. For a mention of him, see M. C. L. R., iii. 169.

[4] As these articles stand here, they scarcely bring out the points scrupled by Martindale. It is instructive to compare his own account (*Autob.*, 67): "I thought that deacons were as fully warranted . . . in Scripture as ruling elders. 2. That neither could act before ordination. 3. I could not answer to Christ if I undertook a pastoral charge over the prophane of the congregation, our hands being bound out from excommunicating . . . the incorrigible. 4. I could not easily satisfy myself how any confederation amongst ourselves or authoritative sanction could constitute us a church of a new classical form *jure divino*, whereby I should be authorized and obliged to exert a pastoral power of feeding by discipline . . . whom I was not like to see

Manchester, June 8, 1647.

(1) In an ordinary way ministers not to bee ordayn'd but by ministers.

(2) Ministers, as ministers, have power to ordayne in any congregation that gives them a call, and this call is the consent of the people.

(3) In an ordinary way ministers are to be ordain'd in the presence of the Church to which they are appointed, and by which they are chosen.

(4) The congregacion of Gorton (though it stand in need of much reformacion), yet is such a Church as may be communicated with in all ordinances without a new constitution.

(5) Elders of severall churches, haveing the consent of the major part of every congregation, distributively considered, may rule their churches in comon unto all censures.

(6) What I judge of the Church of Gorton and the comunion to be houlden with it I judge of the rest of the churches of England in generall.

Richard Heyricke. A. Martindale.
John Angier.
Richard Hollinworth.
John Harison.

4.—The members of the last classis appointed to deale with Mr. Wigan return'd answer that the said Mr. Wigan, not desireing to meete them as members of a classis but as fellow brethren, promised to returne his scruples to them in writing. Not yet done.

5.—Upon complaint of clandestine mariage by Mr. Jones, it is order'd that the elders of that congregation now at this classis doe seriously admonish Mr. Jones that there bee noe more such miscariage by him.

the faces of." In his eclecticism Martindale was a type of a class that was by no means small under the Commonwealth.

6.—Debate about the removing of the font at Flixton. The churchwardens of the said parish are desired to doe it. Request sent to them by the classis.

7.—Upon complaint made of one Mr. Birch,[1] the elders for Prestwich are desired to give him notice to bee at the next classical meeting to give satisfaction of his due performance of ministeriall office.

8.—A man that is guilty of notorious sinne publiquely knowne, when the eldership have dealt with him and found some willingnesse in him to give satisfaction, they are to publish this his willingnesse, and to desire the congregation to pray for him, and observe the proceeding of the worke of God in him, preparing him for publique satisfaction.

9.—Thomas Rudd desireing satisfaction about incest, is to repaire to Mr. Warden and Mr. Hollinworth and Mr. Clayton, who are desired to give account thereof the next classis.

10.—Mr. Benson and Mr. Clayton desired to deale with Willm. Hardy and Jane his pretended wife, concerning their former miscariage, and to give an account the next classis of their proceedings.

11.—Mr. Walker and John Wright desired to goe to the generall meeting at Preston.

12.—Mr. Walker desired to give warning to Mr. Hall, and Mr. Isaac Dehow to give warning to Mr. Briggs' expectants to appeare before the classis the next meeting.

13.—The next classis to be Thursday, the 8th of July. Mr. Hollinworth moderator.

Mr. Warden ended with prayer.

[1] See *postea*. Mr. Birch was the schoolmaster of Prestwich. He had performed baptisms, and may have been in some sort in holy orders. He proved very contumacious to the classis.

THE 6th MEETING at Manchester, July 8o, 1647.

1.—Mr. Hollinworth, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderPP deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

For Manchester : Richard Haworth, Edward Johnson, Richard Meare, Raph Briddocke, elders.

For Prestwich :

For Eccles (Mr. Jones, minister, being yet sicke) : Tho. Edge, Tho. Fyldes, Tho. Barlow, elders.

For Ashton-under-line : Mr. Harison, minister ; Edmund Heywood, Robt. Bardsley, elders.

For Denton : Mr. Angier, minister ; Robt. Hyde, Esq., Willm. Booth, elders.

For Newton : Mr. Walker, minister ; John Wright, Peter Ashton, elders.

For Chollerton : Mr. Benson, minister ; John Barlow, James Chollerton, elders.

For Flixton : Mr. Woolmer, minister ; Richard Rogers, Richard Cowpe, junior, elders.

3.—The elders of Eccles (deputed) have spoken to Mr. Jones, and hee hath promised to forbeare clandestine mariages.

4.—Mr. Birch produced testimony supposing him to bee deacon, but produced noe letters or orders. Hee is appointed to produce his letters of ordination before hee execute any ministeriall acte.

5.—All the elders elect for Didsbury are desired to come to the next classis to bee tryed. Mr. Benson and the elders of Chollerton are desired to speake to them. Thomas Rudd and Sybill Rudd are likewise desired to come to the next classis.

6.—Richard Cowpe, an elder of Flixton, desired to come to the next classis to answer his neglect of his office.

7.—A man guilty of publique and notorious scandall, and

unwilling to give publique satisfaction, of such there is publication to be made that the eldership hath dealt with him and hath not found in him that suitable sorrow and willingnes to give satisfaction that his sinne requires, and therefore desire them to pray for him. Private notice is to bee given him of it before it bee done.

8.—It is agreed that a publique fast bee kept at Manchester on Wednesday next but one. Mr. Angier, Mr. Harrison, and another are to keep it.

9.—The businesse between the subscribers of a note chargeing malice upon Robert Browne and others, and the said Robert Browne, referred to the congregationall eldershipp to see if they can end it.

10.—It is agreed that the ministers endeavour to promote the petition of Mr. Alexander Moore (a Lancashire gentleman come out of Ireland) in there severall congregations, recommended to them by Coll^ll^ Ashton,[1] Coll^ll^ Moore,[2] Mr. Hyde.

11.—Persons not maryed by their owne ministers, nor publiquely, may bee called before the congregationall elder^pp^ to shew where, when, and by whom they were maryed, that they may free themselves from suspicion of living in whoredome.

12.—Mr. Walker and Mr. John Wright are desired to tell Mr. Hall that this is the third day that he hath beene expected by the classis: that Mr. Holland give the like notice to Mr. Briggs: and Mr. Angier is desired to speak to Mr. Martindale, to know the reason of his not coming, seeing hee hath professed to have receiv'd satisfaction.

[1] Colonel Ralph Ashton, of Middleton, the M.P. for the county in the Long Parliament, afterwards Major-General. 1605—Feb. 17, 1650. See his descent, &c., in Baines, ii. 397. The Ralph Ashton who represented Clitheroe in the Long Parliament was of the Ashtons of Great Lever and Whalley. But there is some confusion as to them. *Cf.* Rose's *Notes*, iii. 30, with Baines *supra*.

[2] Colonel Moore is the celebrated Colonel John Moore, who represented Liverpool in the Long Parliament. Died in Ireland in 1650. For an account of him see Rose's *Notes*, ii. 151. There are in the British Museum five volumes of his *Diary* of the Long Parliament during part of the year 1641—of unique value.

13.—The next classis to bee Wednesday, Aug. 4, 1647. Mr. Hollinworth moderator.

Ended with prayer.

THE 7th MEETING at Manchester, August 4, 1647.

1.—Mr. Hollinworth, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting :—

For Manchester *ut supra:* Tho. Smith, John Brownsword, Robt. Bradshaw, Tho. Diconson, elders.

For Prestwich: Toby Furnesse, minister; Peter Sergiant, James Wroe, elders.

For Eccles (Mr. Jones sicke): Tho. Warburton, Tho. Barlow, elders.

For Flixton: Mr. Woolmer, minister; Tho. Walkden, Richard Rogers, elders.

For Ashton-under-line: Mr. Harison, minister; Captn Ashton, Robert Leech, elders.

For Chollerton: Mr. Benson, minister; John Barlow, James Chollerton, elders.

For Denton: Mr. Angier ab[sent], Willm. Booth, John Gee, elders.

For Newton: Mr. Walker, minister; John Wright, Thomas Baron, elders.

3.—Orderd that Mr. Hall bee summon'd to answer his non-appearance and for some miscariages in his ministry, and unlesse hee engage himselfe to come to the next classis, to stand disallowed. Mr. Walker and Mr. John Wright appointed hereunto.

4.—Mr. Birch not allowed to exercise ministeriall actes within this classis.

5.—Agreed that William Hardy and his reputed wife are bound in conscience to consummate their mariage. Shee absolutely refuseth ever to mary him. Voted that they are guilty of

fornication. He acknowledgeth it a great sinne in him, but asserts shee is his wife before God.

6.—Peter Seddon,[1] senior, & John Walworth[2] examined & approved elders of Ringley.

7.—Agreed that the pretended mariage between Thomas Rud and Sibill Rud is incestuous and null. Thomas Rudd, appearing, acknowledged his fault, and submitts to censure. Agreed that hee bee suspended, & so declared to bee in every congregation solemnly within the classis the next Lords day but one.

8.—Willm. Wood and his wife complayneing of defamation, referred to the elderpp of Chollerton to end it, otherwise to returne it in writing to the next classis.

9.—Mr. Brierly of Salford and Mr. Jno. Taylor of Ellenbrough desired to come to the next classis.

10.—Agreed that the elders elect of Didsbury should bee summond againe by Mr. Clayton to come to the next meeting.

11.—Mr. Hugh Taylor and Mr. Briggs tendred themselves at this meeting to ordinacion. Begunne their examinacions, and made some progresse. See the folio of their ordination more fully.

12.—The next meeting to bee Thursday, September 2, 1647.

Moderator ended with prayer.

[1] Peter Seddon is the well-known correspondent of Nathan Walworth, and a yeoman of Pilkington. See his descent in the volume of Walworth *Correspondence*, also *Manchester Court Leet Records*, ii. 342. Born 1579, died 1663; buried at Ringley. His eldest son, Peter, who also occurs as an elder of this classis, was baptised at Prestwich 6th April, 1617, and was a captain in the Parliamentary Army. The inventory of Peter Seddon of Middle Hilton was proved at Chester, 1697. The third son, John, was a captain in the Royal Army, and was regarded as the renegade of the family. The fourth son, Robert, will occur later in a ministerial capacity.

[2] John Walworth. See Walworth *Correspondence*, p. 30. He was a relative of Nathan, and contributed to the foundation fund of Ringley Chapel and to the maintenance of Mr. Holland in 1653 (10*s.* out of a total of £5 13*s.* 4*d.*). According to Newcome, he fell off from his profession and disgraced it by drinking. In the list of protestors of 1642 he appears under Outwood-in-Pilkington. The will of "John Wallworth of Lancashire" was proved in London, 1659.

THE 8th MEETING at Manchester, September 2o, 1647.

1.—Mr. Hollinworth, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting :—

Manchester *ut supra :* Rich. Meare, Jno. Brownsword, Robt. Bradshaw, Raph Bridocke, elders.

Prestwich : Mr. Furnesse, minister.

Eccles (Mr. Jones sicke) : John Clively, Richard Edge, and Thomas Barlow, elders.

Flixton : Mr. Woolmer, minister ; Thomas Walkden, Richard Rogers, elders.

Ashton-under-line : Mr. Harison, minister ; Captain Ashton, Captn Sandiforth, elders.

Denton : Mr. Angier ab[sent], Robt. Hyde, John Gee, elders.

Chollerton : Mr. Benson, minister ; John Barlow, James Chorlton, elders.

Newton : Mr. Walker, minister ; Thomas Baron, Peter Ashton, elders.

3.—Mr. Briggs sent his excuse for not appearing. Allow'd.

4.—Mr. Ad. Martindale to bee warn'd to appeare at the next meeting by Mr. Angier.

5.—Mr. James Hall appear'd. Acknowledg'd his mistake in baptising, being unordain'd. Hath liberty till the next meeting but one to prepare for his ordination.

6.—The businesse about Captn Birche of Ardwicke receiv'd, upon appeale, into the classis.

7.—Alice Godward has warrant (upon complaint of slander) for Abraham Stansfield and her witnesses to appeare the next meeting.

8.—Mr. John Swan tendred himselfe to ordinacion. Made progresse in his examinacion. See the folio for ordinacion.

9.—The next meeting to bee upon Tewsday, October the 5th, 1647. Mr. Hollinworth moderator.

10.—Agreed that Wednesday, October the 6th next, bee the day for ordination of Mr. Hugh Taylor and Mr. John Swanne at Ellinbrough Chappel. Mr. Heyricke and Mr. Angier preach ; Mr. Harison and Mr. Furnesse pray.

Moderator ended with prayer.

Ordination by the Presbyters of the First Classis in the County of Lancaster of Two Expectants viz., Mr. Hugh Taylor and Mr. John Swann, October 6, 1647.

Preparation thereunto (according to ordinance of Parliament) begunne August 4, 1647.

Mr. Hugh Taylor, aged about 28 yeares, M^r^ of Artes of Edinburgh, brought certificate of his taking the Nationall Covenant, of his being M^r^ of Artes of Edinburgh, of his large progresse and abilityes in Divinity from S^tt^ Andrawes, Scotland, & of his good conversation. Desired and freely elected by the people of Ellinbrough, who gave testimony with him. Was examined according to the ordinance. His instrument affixed, to the Chappell at Ellenbrough returned without exception. His pos[ition], *an renati possunt vivere sine peccato?* His neg. def. approved, and the 6th day of October ordained at Ellinburgh. See all these full on the file.

Mr. John Swan, aged 29 yeares, Bachilar of Artes of Magdalen Colledge, brought certificate of his age, his taking the Nationall Covenant, testimoniall of his being Bachelar of Artes of Magdalen Colledge, of his sufficiency and honest conversation from many ministers in Cheshire, of his good conversation from Weverham. Desired and freely elected by the people of Baddeley, in Cheshire. Was examined according to the ordinance. His instrument affixed to the Church doore at Baddeley returned without exception. His pos[ition], *an Christianus magistratus potest legitime tolerare omnes religiones*? Neg. def. Approv'd, and the 6th day of October ordayn'd at Ellinbrough. See all these full on the file as before.

Upon the 6th day of October, 1647, being appointed a fast for this present businesse, Mr. Angier preachd in the church at Ellenbrough. The aforesaid expectants made publique confession of their faith, etc., according to the ordinance, before the congregation at the said chapell. With earnest prayer they were very solemnly set apart for the ministry by imposition of hands, and after had such testimonialls as these deliver'd to each of them, thus signed, nothing divers but as is after express't :—

Apud Ellenbrough,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. Hugh Taylor, M^r^ of Artes, aged about 28 years, hath addressed himselfe unto us, authorised by ordinance of both Houses of Parliam^tt^ of the 26th August, 1646, for the ordinacion of ministers, desireing to bee ordayn'd a presbyter, for that hee is chosen for the worke of the ministry in the church of Ellinbrough, in the county of Lancaster, as by a certificate now remaining with us touching that his election appeareth : and hee having likewise exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his taking the Nationall Covenant, his diligence and proficiency in his studyes, and unblameableness of life and conversation : hee hath beene examined according to the rules for examination in the said ordinance expressed, and thereupon approved : and there haveing beene noe just exception made ag^tt^ his ordination and admission, these may testify to all whom it may concerne that upon the 6th day of this month of Octob. we have proceeded solemnly to set him apart to the office of a presbyter and worke of the ministry of the gospell by the laying on of our hands, with fasting and prayer, by virtue whereof wee doe declare him to be a lawfull and sufficiently authorised minister of Jesus Christ ; and haveing good evidence of his lawfull and faire calling, not only to the worke of the ministry, but to the exercise thereof in the Church of Ellenbrough, in the county aforesaid, wee doe hereby actually admitt him to the said charge, to perform all the offices and dutyes of a faithfull pastor there,

exhorting the people in the name of Jesus Christ willingly to receive and acknowledge him as the minister of Christ, and to maintaine and encourage him in the execution of his office, that hee may bee able to give up such an account to Christ of their obedience to his ministry as may bee to his joy and their everlasting comfort. In witnes whereof wee, the presbyters of the first classis in the county of Lancaster, have hereto sett our hands this 6th day of October, anno dni 1647.

Apud Ellenbrough,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. John Swanne, Bachelor of Artes, aged 29 yeares, hath addressed, etc. *verbatim ut supra* . . . for the worke of the ministry in the church of Baddeley, in the county of Chester, etc. . . . but to the exercise thereof in the church of Baddeley, in the county aforesaid, etc. . . . hands this 6th day of October, anno dni 1647.

Signed both alike by

John Angier.	Rich. Benson.
John Harison.	Edw. Woolmer.
Rich. Hollinworth.	Willm. Walker.
Tobye Furnes.	Tho. Holland.

THE 9th MEETING at Manchester, October 6, 1647.

1.—Mr. Hollinworth, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

Manchester *ut supra:* Edward Johnson, Thomas Smith, Tho. Diconson, Row. Wright, elders.

Prestwich : Mr. Furnes, minister.

Eccles : Mr. Jones sicke still, Thomas Fyldes, Thomas Edge, Willm. Smith, elders.

Flixton : Mr. Woolmer, minister ; Rich. Rogers absent, Thomas Walkden, elders.

Ashton-under-line : Mr. Harison, minister ; Capt. Ashton, Robt. Leech, Robt. Lees, John Thorpe, elders.

Denton : Mr. Angier, minister ; Robt. Hyde, Esq., Willm. Booth, elders.

Chollerton : Mr. Benson, minister ; John Barlow, James Chollerton, elders.

Newton : Mr. Walker, minister ; John Wright, Peter Ashton, elders.

3.—Complaint made by Mr. Woolmer of 2 elders who neglect the discharge of their duty after the acceptation of their office, viz., Rich. Rogers and Rich. Cowpe. Orderd that a warrant bee sent for them to appeare at the next meeting.

4.—Mr. Swan's examination in reference to ordinacion. Examined further in the principles of religion. Defended negativè, *an magistratus Christianus potest legitime tolerare omnes religiones?* Approv'd.[1]

[1] The entry of the conclusion of Swan's examination after the notice of his ordination shows that these minutes were a compilation made at some date subsequent to the meetings themselves. The compilation was evidently made from files of notes, notices, certificates, &c. Other proofs of this will occur.

5.—The difference betweene the minister and elders of Chollerton is to bee heard at the next meeting. Both parts are then to bring in their evidence.

6.—The next classicall meeting to be Wednesday, the 3rd of November, 1647. Mr. Woolmer moderator.

Moderator ended with prayer.

THE 10th MEETING at Manchester, November 3°, 1647.

1.—Mr. Woolmer, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

Manchester: Mr. Heyricke, warden; Jno. Brownsword, Robt. Bradshaw, Raph Briddock, Ric. Meare, elders.

Eccles (Mr. Jones yet sicke): Richard Edge & Thomas Warburton, elders.

Prestwich: Mr. Furnes, minister; Mr. Peter Sergeant, James Wroe, elders.

Flixton: Mr. Woolmer, minister; Peter Egerton, Esq., Tho. Walkden, elders.

Ashton-under-line (Mr. Harison absent): Robt. Ashton, Robt. Bardsley, Robt. Lees, elders.

Denton (Mr. Angier absent): Robt. Hyde, Willm. Booth, elders.

Newton (Mr. Walker absent): John Wright, Peter Ashton, elders.

Chollerton: Mr. Benson, minister; John Barlow, James Chollerton, elders.

3.—Mr. Guest presented himselfe for ordination. Produced patrons donation; testimonial for life. See his examination, etc., on the file *et in proprio loco.*

4.—Mr. Hopwood presented himselfe to ordination. Appointed to come to the next meeting.

5.—Ordred that Mr. Hall, Mr. Briggs, Mr. Brerely bee peremptorily summon'd to the classicall meeting.

6.—Chollerton people to be warn'd by Mr. Hyde.

7.—The next classicall meeting to bee Tewsday, November 16th, 1647. Mr. Heyricke moderator.

Moderator ended with prayer.

THE 11th MEETING at Manchester, November 16th, 1647.

1.—Mr. Heyricke, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

Manchester *ut supra:* Edw. Johnson, Tho. Smith, Rowland Wright, Tho. Diconson, elders.

Prestwich : Mr. Furnes, minister ; James Wroe, Adam Gaskell, John Scoales, James Taylor, elders.

Eccles (Mr. Jones yet sicke) : Thomas Rogers, Thomas Edge, elders.

Ashton-under-line : Mr. Harison, minister ; Capt. Sandiforth, Isaac De How, Edm. Hopwood, elders.

Flixton : Mr. Woolmer, minister ; Colll Egerton, Thomas Walkden, elders.

Denton : Mr. Angier, minister ; Robert Hyde, Esq., Willm. Booth, elders.

Newton : Mr. Walker, minister ; Tho. Baron, Peter Ashton, elders.

Chollerton : Mr. Benson, minister ; John Barlow, James Chorlton, elders.

Ringley : Mr. Holland, minister ; Peter Seddon, John Walworth, elders.

3.—Mr. Constantine, presented by the people at Ouldam for allowance to bee their minister, appear'd to bee an ordayn'd minister; formerly had officiated at Fairfield and Buxtons in Darbishire. A letter written to the congregation there to know the said Mr. Constantine's condicion, whether hee might freely come to the said people at Ouldam.

4.—The businesse of Mr. Tobie Furnes, minister at Prestwich, who complaind of John Broxup for scandalizing him privately, brought a very large testimony from the inhabitants of Prestwich for his soundnesse in doctrine and integrity of life. John Broxup made answer to his complaint, and brought in articles ag^{tt} him upon the file. Upon which divers witnesses were produced, who attested as followeth :—

To the 4th article :

John Eaton, deposed, saith that about 7^{ber} was two yeares hee brought his child to Prestwich church to bee baptized. Confesseth that hee was not the day before at the house of Mr. Furnes to informe him of his child to bee baptized, and that he tendred not the child to Mr. Furnes to bee baptized.

Miles Mather, aged about 60 yeares, husbandman, deposed, saith that Mr. Furnes did not deny to baptise his child, and that hee did not tender the said child to bee baptized to Mr. Furnes, but only informed the clarke of Prestw^{ch} with it, and that the child was baptized by Mr. Birch.

Richard Lomax, aged about 39 years, dwelling in Bury parish, deposed, saith that Mr. Furnes was by the said deponent at his house desired to baptise his child the next fast day, who (being at his study) by his wife returned answer that hee was willing, and upon the fast day the said child was baptized by Mr. Birch.

John Ramsbottom, of Pilkington, aged about 53, deposed, saith that the said deponent brought his child into

Prestwich church on a Lord's day to bee baptized. Mr. Furnes asked, seeing there was three children brought to bee baptized, and hee had only notice of two, whose the third was? The said deponent answered it was his. Mr. Furnes replyde it were a good deed to refuse to baptize it, and so proceeded in the ordinance. When hee came to the acte of baptizing, Mr. Furness demanded who presented the child? This deponent layd his hand upon the child in a womans armes. Mr. Furnes required this deponent to take the child in his armes, who refusing, Mr. Furnes did not baptize the child. Upon Saturday next after, this deponent asked Mr. Furnes to baptize his child or to give him a note to some other to baptise it, who answer'd that hee would neither baptise it nor give any such note unlesse the said deponent would present it as hee would have it.

Cicily Brideoake [1] of Cheetham, widdow, aged almost 60 yeares, deposed, saith that Mr. Furnes would have John Ramsbottom to present his child in his owne armes, who refuseing, Mr. Furnes did not baptize it: this was this last summer.

To the 5th article:

Richard Barlow of Pilkington, aged about 42 years, deposed, saith that the said deponent and his mother, examined by the elderpp., were notwithstanding forbidden by Mr. Sergtt, in the name of the elderpp, to come to the communion. Further saith that Mr. Sergeant tould him that hee believed they were short in their answers at the elderpp, and that there was

[1] Cicily Brideoke was the mother of Ralph, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, 1675–1678. The notice is interesting, as it serves to correct an error in Le Neve. (*Fasti*, i. 252.) Le Neve states that at his death in 1678 the bishop was 74. A calculation of the mother's age will show that this is too much by ten years. Ralph was born in 1612–13.

noe objection of scandall ag^tt^ them, and that in a month's time they had noe notice of the insufficiency of their answers.

John Barlow of Pilkington, aged about 60 yeares, deposed, saith that the said deponent, being examined by the eldership at Prestwich, and from them receiving a tickett,[1] was afterwards forbidden by Mr. Sergeant to come to the Lord's Supper, the s^d^ deponent being consented to forbeare, the said Mr. Sergeant alleadging that he was informed he had sworne, this deponent answering that there was few men but they had sworne.

To the last (the 6th) article :

George Gilliam of Tetlow, husbandman, aged about 30 yeares, deposed, saith that upon Tewsday, the 30th day of June, anno 1646, betwixt the houres of three and six in the afternoone, Mr. Furnes, coming on horsebacke from Manchester, met this deponent, the said Mr. Furnes being drunke, for that his horse justled this deponent in the way, and that the said Mr. Furnes fell from his horse, and could not rise without helpe. Further saith that this deponent neither saw nor otherwise knew that the said Mr. Furnes had drunke any wine or strong drinke that day.

[1] See Oliver Heywood's notice of these "tickets" in the life of his father (Collected Works, i. 580) : "The eldership made an order that every communicant, as often as he was to partake of the Lord's Supper, should come to some of the ruling elders on the Friday before and request and receive a ticket, which he was to deliver in to the elders immediately before his partaking of that ordinance. This ticket was of lead, with a stamp upon it, and the design was that they might know that none intruded themselves without previous admission. The elders went through the congregation and took the tickets from the people, and they had to fetch them again by the next opportunity, which was every month. But this became the occasion of great dissension in the congregation," etc. Heywood believed that the scheme was only tried at Bolton. This is incorrect, but wherever tried it produced great dissatisfaction.

Joseph Streete of Heaton, aged about sixty-two yeares, deposed, saith that upon the same day that (as reported) Mr. James Lancashire was marryed this deponent met Mr. Furnes towards Prestwich, and that the said Mr. Furnes overtooke the said deponent backe againe towards Manchester; that Mr. Furnes' horse press't upon this deponent; and being gone something further, the said Mr. Furnes, sitting upon his horsebacke, vomited either wine or strong ale. Further saith that hee knoweth not that the said Mr. Furness had drunk either wine or stronge beere that day.

Robert Locke of Tetlow, aged about 66 yeares, deposed, saith that comeing from Mr. John Lomax house in hay time, the same day (as reported) that Mr. James Lancashire was maryed, Mr. Furnes overtooke this deponent betweene the pinfould and Mr. John Lomax house, about 6 of the clocke at night; that Mr. Furnes gave this deponent the time of the day, and said to this deponent that hee rid upon a wild young horse w^{ch} hee could not rule. This deponent desired Mr. Furnes to keepe his spurrs out of his horse's sides and hee might rule him. Further saith that this deponent did not perceive, either by his speech or other cariage, that the said Mr. Furnes was overtaken with drinke, but that hee rid very fiercely, and his horse runne his nose into the hedge.

John Ouldam of Heaton Norres, aged about 40 yeares, deposed, saith that hee never saw the said Mr. Furnes drunke in his life to his knowledge: that hee met the said Mr. Furnes from Manchester upon the broad cawsey towards Chetam hill towards evening, and that hee saw nothing by him but as any other man. That this depon^{tt} found a fringed glove, w^{ch} he left with John Glover. That the said Mr. Furnes went

out of the way, but on what occasion this deponᵗᵗ knoweth not.

John Moreton of Chetham Hill, aged about 30 yeares, husbandman, deposed, saith that about three or four aclocke afternoone the same day that (as reported) Mr. James Lancashire was maryed, this deponᵗᵗ mett Mr. Furnes violently riding towards Prestwᶜʰ. That this deponent stay'd to see whether he fell or noe, and that hee did not fall in this deponent's sight. That this deponᵗᵗ saw the said Mr. Furnes leaned first on one side the horse and then on the other. Saith that hee believeth the said Mr. Furnes was more distemper'd at that time with drinke then at another time, but would not take his oath that he was drunke.

5.—The next classis to bee Wednesday, 8° Decembris, 1647. Mr. Heyricke moderator.

Moderator ended with prayer.

THE 12ᵗʰ MEETING at Manchester, December the 8°, 1647.

1.—Mr. Heyricke, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderᵖᵖˢ deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

For Manchester *ut supra:* Robert Bradshaw, Rich. Meare, John Brownsword, Raph Bridoake, elders.

For Prestwich : Mr. Furnes, minister ; James Wroe, John Scoales, James Smethurst, elders.

For Eccles (Mr. Joanes sicke) : John Clively, Thomas Fyldes, elders.

For Ashton-under-line : Mr. Harison, minister; Robert Ashton, Robert Leech, elders.

For Flixton :

For Denton : Mr. Angier, minister ; Robt. Hyde, Willm. Booth, elders.

For Newton : Mr. Walker, minister ; John Wright, Thomas Biron [Baron], elders.

For Chollerton :

For Ringley : Mr. Holland, minister ; Peter Seddon, John Walworth, elders.

3.—Whereas a l^re^ was sent to the inhabitants of Buxtons and Fayrefield to know something further of Mr. Constantine : answer is returned from them that hee is freely discharged from those places. The classis hath given him approbation for Ouldam, the people petitioning for him ; had approbation deliver'd him.

4.—The businesse of Mr. John Broxup and Mr. Furnes being reassum'd, John Broxup refus'd to produce any more witnesses upon the articles exhibited, desireing the classis to proceed to censure upon what proofe hath beene produced.

5.—Mr. Furnes produced witnesses to cleare himselfe against Mr. John Broxup's [1] articles :—

John Scoales of Prestw^ch^, aged about fourty three yeares, husbandman, deposed, saith that the said deponent lent to Mr. Furnes a yong mare to ride to Manchester the same day (as reported) that Mr. James Lancashire was marryed, but unwillingly, because shee was unbroken, haveing never beene ridden with hackney sadle before save once to Preston. That this deponent advis'd the said Mr. Furnes to put off his spurrs, because the said mare would not endure

[1] John Broxup, cloth merchant and "gentleman," of Manchester. He appears among the protestors of Manchester in 1642 as John Broxsam. In 1648 he was fined in the Manchester Leet for short cloth yards, and from 1654 onwards he appears as an officer and juror of the Leet, occurring up to 1671. He signs the election indenture of Charles Worsley in 1654. In the tax of 1668 he is assessed under "Smithy doore." Administration of the estate of John Broxup of Rhodes Green was granted at Chester, 1676. His son of the same name was of Emanuel College, Cambridge.

to be ridden with them. That the said Mr. Furnes did not follow the said deponents advice therein. That the said mare is wilde and not quiet to be riden with spurrs to this day.

Ambrose Jackson of Manchester, mercer, aged about 40 yeares, deposed, saith that in the afternoone of the same day that Mr. James Lancashire was marryed Mr. Furnes came to this deponent's shop with his horse (or mare) in his hand, and tyed her to this deponent's shop doore as hee was on his way homewards. That the said Mr. Furnes bought some comodityes of the said deponent, and stayd about a quarter of an houre in the said shop. That this deponent did not at all perceive that the said Mr. Furnes was in drinke or otherwise distemperd, but as at any other time.

George Barlow of Manchester, barber, aged about thirty-two yeares, deposed, saith that the same day that Mr. James Lancashire maryed Mr. Leaver's daughter Mr. Furnes came into this deponent's shop about five of the clocke afternoone, having a new payre of gloves fringed with blacke, which hee putt in his pockett through his smock coat, the fringe hanging out. That the said Mr. Furnes inquired of this deponent for a note, being a receipt against the ricketts which hee tould this deponent hee would call for when hee first came into town that day. That he read the said note, and desired this deponent that hee would lend him the said note, asking whether it had done this deponent's child any good against the said disease. That the said Mr. Furnes went homewards with his horse or mare in his hand, but was not at all distemperd with drinke, that this deponent did then perceive.

Thomas Smith of Smithfould, chapman, aged about twenty-nine yeares, deposed, sayth that the same day Mr. James Lancashire was maryed this deponent mett Mr. Furnes, towards evening, comeing out of George Barlow's shop. That Mr. Furnes tould this deponent hee was goeing homewards. That by that or other discourse w^ch^ hee had with the said Mr. Furnes this depon^tt^ did not perceive any distemper at all in the said Mr. Furnes, by drinke or otherwise, more then at any other time.

Rowland Wright of Manchester, chapman, aged about fourty-three yeares, deposed, sayth that the same ayd that Mr. James Lancashire was maryed, in the evening, Mr. Furnes, calling at this deponent's house, had some discourse with this deponent and his wife. That the said Mr. Furnesse, being on horsebacke, could not well rule his horse (or mare) because of his wildnes. That this deponent desired his wife to call for some of his servants to take the horse by the head, but none comeing, the horse or mare went violently forward the streete. That this deponent did not perceive any distemper, by drinke or otherwise, in the said Mr. Furnes more than at another time. That the next day morning the said Mr. Furnes came to this deponent to procure enquiery to bee made for a payre of new gloves which hee said hee had lost the night before.

John Wardleworth of Blackley, linen webster, aged about sixty-eight years, deposed, saith that the same day that (as reported) Mr. James Lancashire was maryed Mr. Furnes overtooke this deponent betweene the Red bank and Radleyse of the Peele. That hee did not conceive the said Mr. Furnes to bee in drinke. That the said Mr. Furnes his horse or mare went so fast that this deponent conceiveth that a man

distemper'd with drinke could not have sitten him. That this deponent found a fringed glove a little beyond the said Radleyse house. That this deponent came on foote as farr as the white smithy presently forward, but did not meete the said Mr. Furnes backe againe. That it was about five aclocke at night, as this deponent conceiveth, when the said Mr. Furnes overtooke this deponent.

John Scoales, junior, of Prestwich, husbandman, aged about twenty-two years, deposed, saith that the same day that (as reported) Mr. James Lancashire was maryed this deponent received the mare which this deponent's father lent to Mr. Furnes from the said Mr. Furnes at his comeing home, who tould this deponent that it was a very mad mare, and had hurryed the said Mr. Furnes almost to peeces. That this deponent did not perceive that the said Mr. Furnes was any way distemperd, by drinke or otherwise, more than at another time.

John Lort of Prestwich, weaver, aged about thirty-three yeares, deposed, saith that this deponent came to the house where Mr. Furnes lived the same day that (as reported) Mr. James Lancashire maryed Mr. Leaver's daughter, something before sunne sett. That this deponent stayd supper with the said Mr. Furnes, who afterwards read a chapter and expounded the same, and went to prayer. That this deponent did not at all perceive any distemper in the said Mr. Furnes, by drinke or otherwise, more than at another time. That the said Mr. Furnes complained that hee had lost his gloves, haveing put them betweene his coate and his pockett because of the wett and foulnesse of his bridle raynes.

6.—The next classis to bee upon Wednesday, the 5th of January, 164$\frac{7}{8}$. Mr. Heyricke moderator.

Moderator ended with prayer.

THE 13th MEETING at Manchester, January 5°, 164⅞.

1.—Mr. Heyricke, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

For Manchester : Mr. Hollinworth, Ri. Haworth, Tho. Smith, Robert Bradshaw, Tho. Diconson, elders.

Prestwich : Mr. Furnes, minister ; Peter Sergeant, Adam Gaskell, James Taylor, elders.

Eccles (Mr. Jones sicke) : Thomas Rogers & Thomas Warburton, elders.

Ashton-under-line : Mr. Harison, minister ; Robert Ashton and Robt. Bardsley, elders.

Flixton : Mr. Woolmer, minister ; Pet. Egerton ab[sent], Thomas Walkden, eld.

Denton : Mr. Angier, minister ; Robt. Hyde, Wm. Booth, elders.

Newton (Mr. Walker sicke) : John Wright, Peter Ashton, elders.

Chollerton : Mr. Benson, minister ; John Barlow, James Chorlton, elders.

Ringley : Mr. Holland, minister ; Peter Seddon, John Walworth, elders.

3.—For Mr. Furnes one further witness was produced :

Robert Johnson of Rhodes Milne, aged about thirty-six yeares, milner, deposed, saith that hee met Mr. Furnes the same day that Mr. Lancashire maryed Mr. Leaver's daughter, towards evening, betweene Chetham Hill and the White smithy, and that hee conceived Mr. Furnes rid on a mad horse, and that Mr. Furnes held him hard by the head ; and he conceiveth not that Mr. Furnes was any whit distemperd with drinke, for hee gave this deponent

the time of the day and turned his horse out of the way, that this deponent's loaden horse might have the way.

4.—Examinacion of certaine expectants for ordinacion :

Mr. John Murcott, Bachelor of Artes, aged above 23 yeares, presented himselfe to the classis. Brought certificate of his time in the university, of his taking the Nationall Covenant, and from Mr. Ley and divers ministers of his good conversation and sufficient abilityes, and of his call to the church at Astbury, in Cheshire, from Mr. Ley. Was examined according to the ordinance, gave abundant satisfaction, had an instrument to bee affixed deliverd him, and position, *an authoritas scripturæ dependeat ab authoritate ecclesiæ?* Neg. [negative].

Mr. John Brocklehurst, aged about 28 years, presented himselfe to the classis. Brought certificate from divers ministers of his unblameable life and sufficiency in learninge, of his full and free call to Heath, in Darbishire. Was examined according to the ordinance, gave very good satisfaction, had an instrument to be affixed delivered him, & position, *an prædicatio verbi sit necessaria ad salutem?* Aft^e^. [affirmative].

Mr. Randle Guest, formerly examined, viz. November 3°, 1647, brought a certificate of his good conversation, of his taking the Nationall Covenant, of his call to Poolford, in Cheshire; upon his examinacion according to the ordinance hee gave good satisfacion, had an Instrument to bee affixed deliver'd to him, and position, *an sacra scriptura continet omnia quæ ad salutem necessaria?* Aft.

Mr. Joseph Cope presented himselfe. Brought certificates. Upon his examination found very insufficient, was disallowed.

5.—Mr. Benson produced allegations against his elders at

Chorlton, upon which James Chorlton, elder at Chollerton, confessed that hee gave Mr. Benson the lye as the said Mr. Benson was in the pulpit. The said elders produced allegacions against Mr. Benson, had warrant for witnesses as on the file. The inhabitants of Chollerton desired him to stay.

6.—Divers of the inhabitants of Prestwich complain'd because they were kept from the Sacrament.

7.—Mr. Hall appear'd upon summons, intreating more time: is appointed either to come in the next month to ordinacion or else to forbeare, or to receive inhibition from preaching.

8.—Wednesday, Jan^ry 12° next, is appointed the next classis for Mr. Furnes businesse. Mr. Heyricke, m[oderator].[1]

9.—Tewsday, Febrij 8 next, appointed the classis after for examinacion and disputation, and Wednesday, the 9^th^ Febrij, for ordinacion of the said expectants at Manchester. Mr. Heyricke moderator, Mr. Hollinworth to preach.

Moderator ended with prayer.

The 14^th^ MEETING at Manchester, January 12°, $164\frac{7}{8}$.

1.—Mr. Heyricke, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elder^pps^ deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

For Manchester *ut supra:* Mr. Haworth, Ri: Meare, Robt. Bradshaw, Row. Wright, elders.

Prestwich : Mr. Furnes, minister ; James Wroe, James Smethurst, elders.

Eccles: (Mr. Jones yet sicke) John Clively, Tho. Edge, elders.

Flixton :

[1] Weekly or fortnightly meetings of the Classis are interruptions of the general practice. Usually the Classis met monthly, and intervening meetings are rare, and are due to some case of litigation, or to some sudden emergency. *Cf.* the meeting of 16th November, *supra.*

Ashton-under-line: Mr. Harison, minister; Robt. Bardsley & John Thorpe, elders.

Denton: Mr. Angier, minister; Robt. Hyde, Esq., Wm. Booth, elders.

Newton: (Mr. Walker sicke) Peter Ashton, John Wright, elders.

Chollerton: Mr. Benson, minister; John Barlow, James Cholton, elders.

Ringley: Mr. Holland, minister; Peter Seddon, senior, Jo. Walworke, elders.

3.—Mr. Furnes produced another witnesse to justify himselfe ag^{tt} the xith article:—

Willm. Ingham of Blackley, linnen webster, aged above 40 yeares, deposed, saith that the same day that Mr. James Lancashire maryed Mr. Leaver's daughter, towards evening, this deponent mett Mr. Furnes at the Red banke in the hollow way. That the said Mr. Furnes asked this deponent how hee did, and whether his wife and family were well; that either by that or other discourse, or by any other cariage at that time, this deponent did not perceive any distemper by drinke or otherwise, more then any time before or since, in the said Mr. Furnes.

4.—The next classis to bee Wednesday, the second day of February next, 1647, Mr. Heyricke, moderator, at w^{ch} time the businesse of Mr. Furnes and Mr. John Broxup is to passe to hearing.

5.—It is agreed that whosoever being deputed from any elder^{pp} to the classis comes not by 11 of the clocke shall receive an admonition from the classis, unlesse his excuse be approv'd by the classis.

6.—Mr. Constantine desired from the classis to warne Mr. Briggs to come to the classis the next meeting, 2 Febrij, 164$\frac{7}{8}$.

Moderator ended with prayer.

The 15th MEETING at Manchester, Februarij 2°, anno. 164$\frac{7}{8}$.

1.—Mr. Heyricke, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to the meeting appear'd :—

For Manchester *ut supra:* Thomas Smith, Jno. Brownsword, Raph Briddocke, Tho. Diconson, elders.

Prestwich: Mr. Furnes, minister; Peter Sergeant, James Wroe, John Scoales, elders.

Eccles: Mr. Jones absent; Thomas Filds, Richard Edge, elders.

Flixton:

Ashton-under-line: Mr. Harison, minister; Capt. Ashton, Robt. Leech, elders.

Denton: Mr. Angier, minister; Robt. Hyde, Esq., Wm. Booth, elders.

Newton: Mr. Walker, minister; John Wright, Tho. Baron, elders.

Chollerton: Mr. Benson, minister; John Barlow, James Chorlton, elders.

Ringley:

3.—It was againe tendred to Mr. John Broxup that if he pleased to bring in any witnesses mentioned in his appeale, dat. instant, to be re-examined, or their depositions reviewed, hee should have them so to bee, when hee should produce them to that end. Hee refused so to doe, but sayd hee would stand to his appeale, and made a formall appeale, wch is on the file.

4.—It was confessed by John Barlow and James Chorlton that they speaking with Mr. Benson to choose a text fit to bee treated on before the election of elders, hee said unto them let mee deale, I will bring it in.

John Hoult saith hee was in the lower end of the chappell and cannot speake anything materiall to the questions propounded.

John Warburton saith there was some rayling words betwixt Mr. Benson and the elders at Chollerton, but he went forth of the chappell and remembreth not the words.

George Jackson saith hee knoweth not of any rayling words Mr. Benson gave to the elders.

Nathaniel Taylor saith that Mr. Benson, haveing read a note in Chollerton chappell, James Chorlton said he lyed, and then hee heard Mr. Benson say to James Chorlton that hee was a dishonest man.

James Chorlton acknowledged that hee had wronged Mr. Benson and that hee was sorry for it. This hee was ordered to doe by the classis [*sic*, evidently a lacuna, Sc., make confession of his sorrow].

5.—Examination of another expectant for ordination :

Mr. Willm. Meake brought a certificate from divers reverend divines of his good conversation. Hee hath beene resident in the university of S^t^ Andrewes,[1] in Scotland, though hee tooke no degree there. Is above xxiiij yeares of age. Was examined of his skill in the Tonges, his knowledge in the grounds of religion, and in other things according to the ordinance, wherein hee gave satisfaction. Brought certificate of his taking the Nationall Covenant, of his call to the people at Mothley in Yorkshire. Had an Instrument to bee affixed delivered to him, returnd without exception.

Moderator ended with prayer.

[1] In the *MS.* there is a correction here. In the first instance the words stood thus: "Hee hath not been resident in any university." The correction is made in a different hand, and a stronger blacker ink.

The 16th MEETING at Manchester, Februarij 8o, 1647.

1.—Mr. Heyricke, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

For Manchester *ut supra:* Edw. Johnson, Richard Meare, Rowland Wright, Robt. Bradshaw, elders.

Eccles: Mr. Johnes, minister, appeard; Wm. Smith, Thomas Edge, elders.

Prestwich: Mr. Furnes, minister; James Wroe, Adam Gaskell, elders.

Flixton: Mr. Woolmer, minister; Peter Egerton, Esq., Rich. Rogers, elders.

Ashton-under-line: Mr. Harison, minister; Capt. Ashton, Capt. Sandiforth, elders.

Denton: Mr. Angier, minister; Robt. Hyde, Esq., Wm. Booth, elders.

Newton: Mr. Walker, Thomas Byron, Peter Ashton, elders.

Chollerton: Mr. Benson, minister; John Barlow, elders.

Ringley:

3.—The classis proceeded to determination of the businesse of Mr. Furnes and John Broxup, and upon surveigh and consideration of the whole evidence on both partes, it was agreed:

(1) Touching his pretended deniall of baptisme, etc.

That hee hath done nothing herein contrary to the Directory.[1]

(2) Touching his objected deniall to admitt some persons to the Lord's Supper, etc.

That he hath done nothing in that matter but what was agreed unto by the whole elderpp.

[1] "The child to be baptized, after notice given to the minister the day before, is to be presented by the father or (in case of his necessary absence) by some christian friend in his place, professing his earnest desire that the child may be baptized." *(Directory "of baptism.")*

(3) Touching his being overcome with strong drinke, etc. That is not proved against him by the evidence produced, but many things proved which may witnesse the contrary.

4.—Mr. Murcott, Mr. Brocklehurst, Mr. Meeke, & Mr. Guest brought in their instruments with certificates of their publishing and affixing, maintain'd their positions against their opponents, were approv'd. All their Instruments return'd without exception.

5.—The next classis to bee the 8° Martii, 164$\frac{7}{8}$. Mr. Jones moderator.

Moderator ended with prayer.

ORDINATION BY THE PRESBYTERS OF THE FIRST CLASSIS IN THE COUNTY OF LANCASTER OF FOUR EXPECTANTS, VIZ., MR. JOHN MURCOTT, MR. JOHN BROCKLEHURST, MR. RANDLE GUEST, AND MR. WILLM. MEEKE, AT MANCHESTER, THE 9th DAY OF FEBRUARY, ANNO $164\frac{7}{8}$.

Preparation unto the said ordination according to the ordinance being made and their certificates of taking the Nationall Covenant, sufficient abilityes, good life, and free call to their severall places being rec^d^, w^ch^ remaine upon the file, and being examined and approvd, and their severall Instruments return'd without exception, all which appeares in the precedent classicall meetings: Mr. Brocklehurst took the Nationall Covenant in præsentia hoc die. Upon the xi day of Febrij aforesaid, being appointed a fast for this present businesse at Manchester, Mr. Angier preacht, Mr. Harison and divers others pray'd.

Mr. Heyricke propounded questions to them who before the congregation made publique confession of their faith, etc. According to ordinance, with earnest prayer they were very solemnly set apart to the worke of the ministry by imposition of the hands of the presbyters; and after had such testimonialls as theese following deliver'd to each of them, thus signed :—

Apud Manc^r^,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. John Murcott, Bachelor of Artes, aged about xxiiij yeares, hath addressed himselfe to us, authorised by ordinance of both Houses of Parliam^tt^ of the 26th August, 1646, for the ordination of ministers, desireing to bee ordain'd a presbyter, for that hee is chosen and appointed for the worke of the

ministry in the church of Astbury, in the county of Chester, as by a certificate now remaining with us touching that his election and appoint[t] appeareth: and haveing likewise exhibited a sufficient testimoniall of his taking the Nationall Covenant, his diligence and proficiency in his studyes, & unblameablenesse of life and conversation; he hath beene examined according to the rules for examinacion in the said ordinance expressed, & thereupon approv'd; and there haveing beene noe just exception made against his ordinacion and admission, THESE may testify to all whom it may concerne, that upon Wednesday, the 9[th] day of the month of Febrij wee have proceeded solemnly to set him apart to the office of a presbyter & worke of the ministry of the gospel by the laying on of our hands, with fasting and prayer. By virture whereof wee doe declare him to bee a lawfull and sufficiently authorised minister of Jesus Christ; & haveing good evidence of his lawfull and fayre calling, not only to the worke of the ministry, but to the exercise thereof in the church of Astbury, in the county aforesaid, wee doe hereby send him thither and actually admitt him to the said charge, to performe all the offices and dutyes of a faithfull pastor there; exhorting the people in the name of Jesus Christ to receive and acknowledge him as the minister of Christ, and to maintaine and encourage him in the execution of his office, that hee may be able to give up such an account to Christ of their obedience to his ministry as may bee to his joy and their everlasting comfort. In witnes whereof wee, the presbiters of the first classis in the county of Lancs., have hereto set our hands this 9[th] day of February, anno dni. $164\frac{7}{8}$.

The rest are the same verbatim, except what difference follows, viz :—

Whereas Mr. John Brocklehurst, aged about xxviij yeares, hath addressed, etc. . . . in the church of Heath, in the county of Darby, as by etc. . . . and haveing likewise taken the Nationall Covenant before us, & exhibited sufficient etc. . . . exercise

thereof in the church of Heath, in the county aforesaid etc. . . . sett our hands this 9th day of February, anno dni. $164\frac{7}{8}$.

Apud Manchester,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. Randle Guest, aged about fourty yeares, hath etc. . . . in the church of Poulford, in the county of Chester, etc. . . . exercise thereof in the church of Poulford, in the county aforesaid etc. . . . sett our hands this Wednesday, the 9th day of Februarij, $164\frac{7}{8}$.

Apud Manchester,
in Com. Lanc.

Whereas Mr. William Meeke, aged above xxiiij yeares, hath etc. . . . in the church of Methley, in the county of York, as, etc. . . . exercise thereof in the church of Methley, in the county aforesd etc. . . . in witnesse whereof wee, the presbyters of the first classis in the county of Lancr, have hereto sett our hands this 9th day of Febrij, ano dni. $164\frac{7}{8}$. Apud Manch., in Com. Lanc.

All which were alike subscribed by

Richard Heyricke.	John Jones.
Edw. Woolmer.	John Angier.
John Harison.	Toby Furnes.
Tho. Holland.	Robt. Constantine.

The 17th MEETING at Manchester, March 8, $164\frac{7}{8}$.

1.—Mr. Jones, moderator, begunn with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting appear'd :—

Manchester : Mr. Heyricke, warden ; Raph Bridocke, Tho. Diconson, Robt. Bradshaw, Thos. Smith, elders.

For Prestwich: Mr. Furnes, minister; Peter Sergeant James Wroe, elders.

Eccles: Mr. Jones *ut supra;* Thomas Warburton, Richard Edge, elders.

Flixton:

Ashton-under-line: Mr. Harison, minister; Ottiwell Andrew, Robt. Lees, elders.

Denton: Mr. Angier, minister; Robt. Hyde, Wm. Booth, elders.

Newton: Mr. Walker, minister; John Wright, Peter Asheton, elders.

Chollerton: Mr. Benson, minister; John Barlow, elders.

Ringley:

3.—Samuel Taylor brought an appeale from the elder^{pp} at Chollerton to the classis, in a difference betwixt him and his brother Nathaniel Taylor, accusing the said Nathaniel to have wrongfully slandered him. The said Nathaniel to be sumon'd to the next classis. The s^{d} Samuel to have warrant for witnesses.

4.—Henry Gregory and Richard Rogers (elders at Flixton), brought in a charge against Mr. Woolmer, minister there, for clandestine mariages. Mr. Woolmer to be summon'd to the next meeting: the said H. Gregory and R. Rogers to have warrant for witnesses.

5.—Summons to bee given to James Chorlton, elder at Chollerton, to show cause why hee doth not acte as an elder.

6.—John Barlow, elder at Chorlton, desired to give notice to Mr. Clayton, minister of Didsbury, to show cause at the next meeting why hee proceedeth not to election of elders.

7.—Next meeting upon Wednesday, 5th April, 1648. Mr. Jones, moderator.

Moderater ended with prayer.

The 18th MEETING at Manchester, April 5°, 1648.

1.—Mr. Jones, moderator, begunne with prayer.

2.—Members of the severall congregationall elderpps deputed to this meeting appeard :—

Manchester: Mr. Hollinworth, minister; Rich. Meare, John Brownsword, Row. Wright, Tho. Diconson, elders.

For Prestwich: Mr. Furnes, minister; Peter Sergeant, James Smethurst, elders.

Eccles: Mr. Jones, Tho. Rogers, and William Smith elders.

Flixton: Mr. Woolmer, minister; Peter Egerton, Esq., Tho. Walkden, elders.

Ashton-under-line: Mr. Harison, minister; Robt. Ashton, Hugh Taylor, elders.

Denton :

Newton: Mr. Walker, minister; John Wright, Tho. Baron, elders.

Chollerton: Mr. Benson, minister ; John Barlow, elders.

Ringley: Mr. Holland, minister; Peter Seddon, John Walworth, elders.

3.—Richard Cooper of Ouldam parish to bee summon'd to the next meeting to answer to a charge of fornication brought agt him by Ann Dunkerley, the sd Ann also to bee summoned.

4.—Mr. Angier desired to joyne with Mr. Clayton to move the elders elect at Didsbury, to owne and undertake the worke, and to return answer thereof at the next meeting.

5.—The businesse of Samuel Taylor was examined, who being playntiffe agt his brother Nathaniel Taylor, brought witnes as followeth :

James Chorlton, elder at Chorlton, aged about 50 years, deposed, saith that Nathaniel Taylor said before the jury at Chorlton that Samuel Taylor, his brother, was a forsworne man, and that at another time, as he

was comeing to Manchester hee, the said Nathaniel, sayd in presence of James Hopwood and a shoemaker that his brother Samuel was forsworne in three particulars, and this deponent doth not remember that hee made any explication or distinction of his charge of perjury when hee first charged him before the jury; and the jury fined him, the said Nathaniel, in a noble for rayling at the jury; and the said Nathaniel further said before the court that the Devill was as good a professor as his brother Samuel; and that hee also said, that the meeting of Samuel Taylor and his friends was for bad and base ends, and for to conspire against his brother, or words to that effect.

Josuah Taylor of Marsledge [Marsleache], aged about 26 yeares, deposed, saith that Nathaniel, his uncle, hearing some inquire after Samuel Taylor, this deponent's father, the said Nathaniel answered, here hee is like a forsworne man as hee is, Samuel Taylor, once my name; being asked who that man was w^ch^ enquired after the said Samuel, the said Josuah, this deponent, answers hee doth not remember who hee was, there being several in his master's court (?) w^ch^ he knowes not.

Zachary Taylor of Rusholme, aged 42 yeares, deposed, saith that hee, the said deponent, being sent by Samuel his brother, to the said Nathaniel his brother, the said Nathaniel, after some other discourses, payled [*sic*] his hands and sayd that hee had called his brother Samuel a perjured man, and that he would make it out, and that hee instanced in this particular that Samuel, being a juror, was bound to present himselfe and his sonne about the brawle, as well as Nathaniel, & hee did it not.

6.—Warrant to bee sent for Mr. John Shelmerdine of Rushulme, to give evidence in the forsaid businesse.

7.—Nathaniel Taylor informed that James Chorlton spoke some words about the classe ; hee being called denyed.

8.—James Chorlton being called to show cause why hee doth not execute his office of elder, alleged that they have never sitten as an elder^{pp}; that hee is unfit ; desires to bee freed from his offices ; the businesse differ'd till the next classis till Mr. Benson be acquainted therewith.

9.—Mr. Walker and Mr. Clayton desired to bee at the meeting at Preston, April 18, and Tho. Baron desired to go with them.

10.—Mr. Constantine being desired to show cause why the governm^{t} is not setled with him, answered that the classis gave liberty to deferr it. Mr. Angier & Mr. Harison are desired to take cognizance of the causes, and represent them.

11.—The next classis ordered to bee May 2, 1648. Mr. Harison to be moderator.

Mr. Jones, moderator, ended with prayer.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 07830 118 0

FLARE

FLARE
31262078301180